27240

Bound
Periodical

Kansas City
Public Library

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

This Volume is for

REFERENCE USE ONLY

11-26—6m—P

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1866.

EDITED BY

CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

VOL. XXXVIII.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY

PETER WALKER, 821 CHESTNUT STREET,

AND SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED BY

R. CARTER & BROTHERS, New York; Rev. A. KENNEDY, London, C. W.,

Rev. WILLIAM ELDER, St. John, New Brunswick;

Rev. ROBERT MURRAY, Halifax, N. S.;

and TRÜBNER & CO., London.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

27240
a
6217

BIND. JAN 10 '27

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXVIII.

No. I.

PAGE.

ART. I.—Sustentation Fund..... 1

ART. II.—Common Schools..... 25

ART. III.—The Patristic Doctrine on the Eucharist..... 47

ART. IV.—Horace Mann..... 74

ART. V.—Imperfect Rights and Obligations as related to Church Discipline. 94

ART. VI.—Strauss and Schleiermacher..... 116

ART. VII.—Renan, Strauss, and Schleiermacher..... 133

SHORT NOTICES..... 141

No. II.

ART. I.—Bushnell on Vicarious Sacrifice..... 161

ART. II.—The Samaritans, Ancient and Modern..... 195

ART. III.—The Great Schools of England..... 222

ART. IV.—The Raising of Lazarus..... 248

ART. V.—Dr. Spring's Reminiscences of his Life and Times..... 288

SHORT NOTICES..... 314

No. III.

PAGE.

ART. I.—Rationalism..... 329
ART. II.—Normal Schools..... 361
ART. III.—Relations of India with Greece and Rome..... 394
ART. IV.—McCosh on J. S. Mill and Fundamental Truth..... 416
ART. V.—The General Assembly..... 425
SHORT NOTICES..... 500

No. IV.

ART. I.—The Preaching for the Times..... 513
ART. II.—The Trinity in Redemption..... 553
ART. III.—The Monophysite Churches of the East..... 567
ART. IV.—Forsyth's Life of Cicero..... 577
ART. V.—The Missionary Enterprise, in its bearing upon the Cause of Science and Learning..... 611
ART. VI.—Ecce Homo..... 631
ART. VII.—Dr. Williams's New Trsnslation of the Hebrew Prophets..... 646
SHORT NOTICES..... 670
LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 674

Series 2 Vol 3

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1866.

No. I.

Art. I.—*Sustentation Fund.*

At the recent meeting of the Synod of New Jersey, the Rev. Samuel J. Baird, D. D., as chairman of a committee appointed a year ago, presented an elaborate report on the subject of "unemployed ministers." One reason assigned for the fact that so many ministers, well qualified for the sacred office, were destitute of regular employment, was the insufficiency of support. Many of them had been forced to leave their fields of labour because they could not sustain themselves and families upon the salaries which they received. As the truth of this statement could not be denied, it naturally gave rise to the inquiry, What could be done to meet the difficulty, and to secure to every faithful minister devoted to his work an adequate support? The importance of this question and its bearing on the interests of individuals and of the church, secured for it the earnest consideration of every member of the Synod. In the course of the discussion which arose on this subject, reference was made to the attempt originated in 1847 to secure the adoption of the plan of a general sustentation fund analogous to that which had been so successfully carried out in the Free Church of Scotland. In that year, James Lenox, Esq., of New York, caused to be printed a pamphlet on Church Economics by the late illustrious Dr. Chalmers, a copy of which was sent to every

minister in our church. The sermon before the General Assembly which met May, 1847, in Richmond, Virginia, was devoted to a recommendation of that plan. In the *Princeton Review* for July, 1847, the same scheme was pressed upon the attention of the church. All these efforts proved powerless. They produced no sensible impression. When, however, the same views were presented to the Synod they met with immediate and general approbation, and that body resolved to memorialize the next General Assembly in favour of the adoption of the plan of a sustentation fund. This resolution, we believe, was adopted by an unanimous vote.

The subject was presented to the last General Assembly in an overture from the North River Presbytery, drawn up by the Rev. J. K. Wight. This overture proposed the plan of separate presbyterial sustentation funds; each presbytery being expected to take measures for raising the salaries paid by the feebler churches up to a given standard. The obvious objections to this plan are, 1. That it cuts off the distant, small, and feeble presbyteries from the abounding resources of those which are more numerous and wealthy. 2. It throws the burden of self-support after all on those who are least able to bear it, and effectually prevents the progress of the church towards, and beyond its extremities. Another overture on the same subject was presented to the Assembly from the Presbytery of Indianapolis. It was hardly to be expected that the Assembly could favourably entertain these propositions in the state of the country and of public feeling then existing. The subject was therefore laid aside, with the expression of the judgment of the Assembly, that the object aimed at by these overtures is desirable, and referring to "the unsettled condition of the country," as the reason why it was deemed inexpedient "to adopt measures at present to raise a special sustentation fund by collections in the churches for that object." At the last meeting of the Synod of New York this subject occupied the attention of that body, and a committee of fifteen was appointed to prepare a report to be made at the next meeting.

The facts above mentioned indicate that the mind of the church is awake to the importance of this subject, and is in a favourable state for its consideration. We, therefore, hope

that the following exhibition of the principles and facts which should control our action in this matter, may not prove altogether useless. As God has ordained the preaching of the gospel to be the great means of salvation, and has appointed a class of men to be devoted to that work, and expressly declared that those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel, the duty of providing for the support of the ministry has been recognized in all ages and in all parts of the church. The great practical question has ever been, How can this duty be most advantageously performed? Our limits will not admit of an enumeration of the different methods which have in fact been adopted, much less of any attempt to exhibit their comparative advantages and disadvantages. In this country we are shut up to one or the other of two plans. First, we may throw the responsibility upon the particular congregation of which the minister is the pastor; or, second, we may make the support of the ministry of the church the common duty of the whole church.

The former of these plans has been generally acted upon by Presbyterians in this country from the beginning. It has become so familiar, and regarded so much as a matter of course, that it will probably be a long and difficult process to convince the people that it is not the best or the most righteous plan. It is so obviously unjust and unreasonable, and so out of analogy with the action of the church in other matters, that it has never been adhered to with strictness or uniformity. From the earliest periods of our history we were accustomed to send out missionaries to destitute portions of the church, supported by a general contribution from the church as a whole. And in later times we have made it the duty of the Board of Missions to supplement the salaries of the pastors of feeble congregations in every part of the land. This, as far as it goes, is a recognition of the right principle, and has been the means of incalculable good. Hundreds of churches have been organized, and hundreds more have been cherished until they have become not only self-supporting, but able to aid in sustaining others. But it is obvious, and almost universally admitted, that this mode of operation does not accomplish all that is desirable and obligatory. It leaves a very large proportion of our ministers

to suffer under the greatest privations. They are subjected not only to great self-denials, but to a course of life which is injurious to their health, and to that of their families. Females, delicately brought up and encumbered with the care of children, are obliged to do all their own household work. The children themselves are deprived of the advantages of education, and the minister is either harassed and broken down, or he is forced to turn his attention to secular affairs in order to gain the necessaries of life. If a fair and full statement of the sufferings of a large class of the most faithful of our ministers could be presented to the church, it would fill every heart with shame and sorrow. Our present system not only works this great injustice to the ministers, it is no less unjust and injurious in its operation on the people. A poor man who desires the preaching of the gospel for himself and family, is obliged to pay a larger portion out of his daily earnings than the wealthy members of our flourishing churches. It is a far greater burden for some congregations to raise two or three hundred dollars for their pastors, than for others to raise five or six thousand. The present system throws the burden on those least able to bear it.

But the greatest evil of our present plan is that it cripples the energy of the church, and prevents its progress. Churches begun and cherished for a while are abandoned; promising fields are neglected, and to a large extent the poor have not the gospel preached to them. Hundred of thousands in our cities and in every part of the land are as ignorant almost as the heathen, and they must so continue, and their children after them, so far as we are concerned, if our present plan be persisted in. It is the crying sin and reproach of the Presbyterian Church that it does not preach the gospel to the poor. It cannot do so to any great extent or with real efficiency, if the preacher is to be supported by pew-rents, or by the contributions of those to whom he preaches. What provision have we for preaching to the destitute? How many missionaries have we at home sustained as are our foreign missionaries, independently of those to whom they carry the news of salvation? How is it in New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore? How is it with large districts in our country where a Presbyterian minister

is never seen? It is plain that on our present plan the people by thousands must perish for lack of knowledge, and if other churches were to act on our principles, the gospel would become a luxury, confined almost exclusively to the wealthier classes of the people. We do not think that these facts can be disputed. Nor is it possible for conscientious, Christian men, to look them in the face, and not feel humbled and convinced that something must be done to rescue our church from this reproach, and to enable her to do her part in preaching the gospel to all people.

The great thing, as we believe, to be accomplished is, to bring Presbyterians to feel and acknowledge before God, that the obligation to support those who are called to the ministry is the common duty of the church as a whole. It is not enough that a congregation supports its own pastor, it is not less bound to see that others of their fellow-sinners have the benefits of a Christian church. That the support of the clergy of a church is the common duty of that church as a whole is plain,

1. Because the command of Christ to preach the gospel to every creature is given to the whole church. This is the grand design for which the church was instituted. It was to teach all nations. It was to bear witness to the truth among all people. It was to bring men everywhere to the obedience of the faith, to make them the sincere worshippers and followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, and thus advance his kingdom on the earth. This is what the church exists for. If she neglects this work, and in proportion as she neglects it, she fails of her mission. And any plan of operation which hinders her in the discharge of this great and primary duty ought to be rejected or modified. There can therefore be no greater mistake than for our wealthy congregations to suppose that they discharge their duty in securing the preaching of the gospel to the people of this land when they support their own pastor, and leave others to do as they can. If the church as a whole is bound to see that the gospel is preached to the people of China and India, why is it not bound to see that it is preached to the people of Minnesota and Iowa? The heathen are unwilling, and, in many cases, unable, to support the missionaries of the cross, and therefore we feel bound to send them the gospel. If any portion of the

people of this land are unwilling or unable to sustain the messengers of Christ, we are bound to do it for them, to the extent of our ability. This clearly follows from the command of Christ.

2. It is not every member of the church who is called to preach the gospel. The call to the ministry is a distinct call, given to some and not to others. Christ constituted different offices, making some apostles, others prophets, others evangelists, others pastors and teachers. As the body has its organs each with its appropriate functions, so the church has its organs by which, as the body of Christ, it has to discharge its great duty in the world. What the body would be without hands, feet, and eyes, that the church would be without its divinely constituted officers. The gospel, the apostle teaches us, is designed for all men and necessary for their salvation. Men cannot be saved without faith; but they cannot believe without hearing; and they cannot hear without a preacher, and how can they preach, he asks, except they be sent. It is therefore the church's duty to send preachers to all those who it is the will of God should hear the gospel. To send is not merely to say, Go. That would be easy work. It would give the church no part in the self-denial, the glory, and blessedness of promoting the kingdom of Christ in the world. When the government sends embassadors, or an army, it sustains them. When men send labourers into the field they give them their hire. And where that is withheld, its cry enters into the ears of the Lord of Hosts. In like manner when the church sends forth ministers or missionaries, to discharge, as her organs and officers, the work Christ has given her to do, the church is bound, by the clearest of all obligations, to sustain those whom she sends. And it matters not where she sends them; whether it be at home or abroad; to the heathen of our great cities; to the ignorant in the thinly-settled portions of the country; or to the few scattered sheep of the flock of Christ who may have none to guide them into his pastures and to the living waters.

3. It is to be borne in mind that the minister is not the officer and organ exclusively of the particular congregation of which he may be the pastor. He is a minister and functionary of the church as a whole. He is ordained by the church and for the

church. He is as much a minister without a congregation as with one. He is responsible to the church as a whole, dependent upon it, and employed in its service, and therefore the responsibility for his support rests on the whole church. If he is unworthy, or idle, or inefficient, he may be dismissed, or put on a retired list. But while he is able and willing to work, it is the sin and shame of the church to which he belongs that he is not employed and adequately supported. The relation of a minister to the church is, in this point, analogous to the relation of the officers of the army and navy to the country. Our military officers belong to the country; they are in the service of the country, and they are sustained by the country. The children of the world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. It would be well for the church if she discharged her duty to her ministers as well as the state acquits itself of its obligations to the servants of the public.

4. As it is the common duty of believers to labour for the conversion of sinners, the edification of the people of God, and the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, it is a duty common to them to sustain the ministry, which is the divinely appointed instrumentality for the accomplishment of those ends. We are bound to do what we can for the salvation and spiritual welfare not only of our immediate friends and neighbours, but of all men wherever they are. The souls of men afar off are as precious as those of our neighbours. The honour of Christ is as much promoted by the salvation of the one as of the other. The union of believers effected by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit secures a love for all believers, and the union of all with Christ produces the desire to bring all men to acknowledge and serve him. There is no pure Christian motive to impel a man to support his own pastor, which does not operate to make him desire to secure the blessings of the gospel and of the stated ministry for his fellow-men, and especially for his fellow-citizens. The recognition of the duty to sustain the ministry as obligatory on the church as a whole, as it grows out of the nature of Christianity, and is the proper outworking of its expansive, catholic spirit, would be the greatest blessing to the church itself. It would promote brotherly love, which our Lord so often and explicitly enjoins as the great duty of his disciples. It would call into

more vigorous exercise all Christian graces. It would lead to self-denial, to diligence and zeal in the work of Christ. It would open a new and copious fountain of blessing to the whole land, and do more for the promotion of the best interests of the nation than any other measure we, as a church, could adopt.

5. The principle in question is recognized in other departments of Christian and benevolent enterprise. Even the state, which is held together by far weaker bonds than those which unite the people of God, recognizes it as a common duty to provide for the education of the people. It is common to hear selfish and narrow-minded men say that it is unreasonable to tax one man for the education of another man's children. If he wishes them to be educated, let him pay for it himself. This selfish spirit has at times and places prevailed, and the principle has been adopted of making every teacher dependent on his school for his support. But this plan has been repudiated in every enlightened Christian community. The benefits of knowledge, and especially the ability to read the word of God, were recognized as privileges belonging to all classes, poor as well as rich, to the children of the ignorant and indifferent as well as to those capable of estimating the advantages of mental culture and willing to make sacrifices to secure them for their offspring. It was seen too that the interests of society as a whole, and of all the classes of which it is composed, demand the general education of the people. What was a common benefit should be a common burden. Hence in every enlightened community we have free schools and a school fund; adequate provision is made by a general tax in some way to render the blessings of education attainable by all the people. Why should not the church act on the same principle? Will Christians say that it is unreasonable for them to be taxed to secure the gospel for other men? Will they say, Let those who want the gospel pay for it themselves? No man professing to be a Christian would venture to utter such sentiments aloud. They would shock the most sluggish conscience. Besides, if the common interests of the state are promoted by general education, will not the common interests of the church, which are of so much higher order, be promoted by making the gospel and the ministry accessible

to all its members and to all men? We are simply urging the duty of making a common benefit a common obligation. If we act in reference to the heathen on the principle that the church is one, and that the obligation to send them the gospel rests on the whole church, why should we not act on the same principle in reference to our own people? If it is obligatory in the one case, it is still more obligatory in the other.

This matter is so plain that it cannot well be disputed. Indeed it may be said to be universally recognized. Our Board of Domestic Missions is founded on the principle that it is the duty of the whole church to aid in rendering the gospel accessible to those who of themselves are not able to sustain the expense of a stated minister. This is important as an acknowledgment of a principle; and no one can doubt that great good has resulted to the church and to the country from the operations of that Board. But it does not, and cannot, with its present aim and method, accomplish what the full recognition of the unity of believers and the interests of the church demand. It is well however to bear in mind that in advocating the organization of a sustentation fund, we are only advocating the carrying out more effectually the principle on which the Board of Domestic Missions has been conducted. It may also anticipate one class of objections to say, that the adoption of the plan which has so successfully operated in Scotland, does not necessitate any interference with the work of that Board. It, even as now organized, may be the agent of the church for carrying out the Scottish plan in its application to our church.

Some persons have supposed that by a sustentation fund was intended a permanent fund, the annual interest of which was to be applied to add some five or seven hundred dollars to the salary of every Presbyterian minister in the country. This is a wild idea. This would require a fund of eight or ten millions of dollars. If such a sum could be raised for such a purpose, which is impossible, it would throw the burden of supporting the ministry of the future in large measure on the present generation. No such idea has been seriously entertained in any quarter.

A sustentation fund is a sum raised by annual contributions to carry out the two principles, first, that every minister of

the gospel devoted to his work is entitled, by the command of Christ, to a competent support; and secondly, that the obligation to furnish that support rests upon the church as a whole. That is, that the church in her organic unity is bound to provide an adequate support for every man whom she ordains to the ministry, and who is qualified and willing to devote himself to her service. The soundness of these principles we have endeavoured to establish. In carrying them out the following guiding rules are important.

First, that the contributions to this fund are to be general. While special donations are to be gratefully received, and large contributions from a few wealthy congregations may be reasonably expected, yet success is out of the question, unless every member of the church, as far as possible, is willing to contribute according to his ability. In Scotland, although extraordinary liberality has been exhibited by individuals and congregations in the support of this fund, yet from the beginning the main dependence was placed upon the general contributions of the people. This was a point on which Dr. Chalmers strenuously insisted. He warned the weaker churches from relying on the stronger, and insisted that those who were not willing to help themselves, could not expect to be always helped by others. The duty to contribute to the support of the gospel is as obligatory upon the poor as upon the rich. It is as important as a means of culture for the former as for the latter, to practise self-denial and liberality in the service of Christ. The aggregates of small contributions from a multitude will always exceed that of the larger contributions of the few. The hundreds of millions raised by our government for national expenses from year to year, are made up principally by the five, ten, and twenty dollar taxes paid by the millions, and not by the thousands paid by a few hundred of the population. This therefore is to be settled in the minds of the church from the start. The sustentation fund is not a plan for relieving the poor from the duty of sustaining the ministry, and for throwing that burden exclusively upon the rich. None partake of the blessings of the gospel, who do not participate in its duties. And no man however poor has reason to regard himself as a Christian who is not willing to do what he can to secure for himself and others

the ministration of God's word and of the ordinances of his house. In Scotland, therefore, provision is made for the contributions of those who are not able to pay even as much as a penny a week.

There is always a tendency in the poor of a congregation to throw all pecuniary burdens on the richer members of the church, and a similar tendency on the part of weak churches to rely upon those which are more wealthy. This tendency is in both cases to be resisted; in the former case, both for the poor themselves and for the sake of the congregation to which they belong. The same principles apply in their full force against the disposition of weaker churches to rely exclusively or mainly upon assistance from abroad. It enervates and degrades the weak, and it puts the liberality of the strong to a trial they will not be likely long to sustain. This was found to be "the sorest and heaviest impediment" in the way of the success of the plan in Scotland, which it was foreseen would infallibly frustrate the measure unless effectually resisted. The friends of the sustentation fund, therefore, said, "We should infinitely less value all the additional hundreds and thousands that might be raised from the wealthier congregations, than we should an average elevation of fifty pounds in the contributions which come from the lower half of the scale. This were like the opening of a gate that would set us at liberty, and make us free to expatiate, so as that we might find our way both to the most wretched population in towns, and to the poorest and remotest extremities of the land."

It is, however, not only on moral considerations that the coöperation of all classes in this work is so desirable, the pecuniary value of the smaller contributions, as just remarked, in the aggregate exceeds all that can be expected from wealthy individuals or congregations. Our mightiest rivers owe their fulness to drops of rain, and all great benevolent operations depend upon the small contributions of the many far more than on the large contributions of the few. Neither class should feel exempted. All must coöperate—each giving according to his ability; and without this general coöperation, any sustentation scheme must inevitably fail.

Secondly. Nothing so chimerical as equality in the salaries

of ministers is contemplated. This would be unreasonable and impossible. The expense of living in one place is ten-fold what it is in another. The demands upon the minister's purse are also far greater in some positions than in others. The people of a congregation who contribute their just proportion to the general fund, have the right, and will always exercise it, to give what they see fit to their own pastor. Unity does not mean uniformity, and parity as to constitutional rights, does not imply equality in everything else. In Scotland the attempt was made to have all the church edifices erected on the same model, and to forbid any addition to the dividend received by each minister from the general fund. This was but an attempt. The good sense of the people revolted against the idea. It was seen that the additional money spent by the wealthier congregations in adorning their places of worship, was not taken from the resources which would have swelled the general building fund, but from money which would otherwise never have found its way into the treasury of the church. And in like manner, the money given to supplement a pastor's salary, was not so much substracted from the sustentation fund, but money which would not have been given at all. In some cases the pew-rents were abolished, on the assumption that the amount paid for the pews would be thrown into the common fund. It was found, however, that the pew-rents were lost, and the fund was not increased. We must allow free scope to the workings of natural feelings, and to religious affections. We cannot secure dead uniformity in anything. The people will dress, and live, and build, and give according to their own dispositions, feelings, tastes, and principles. All we can require, and all that is desirable is, that each and all should have a just regard for others as well as for themselves, and remember that Christian love requires that the necessities of the weak should be supplied from the resources of the strong. What is beyond the limits of that which is necessary to the decent support of the ministry, and the comfort of God's ministers and people, lies outside the sphere of church legislation and ordinances.

It has been objected to the plan of a sustentation fund that it would tend to weaken the bond between the pastor and his people. The Scriptures assume that this is a relation which

implies a reciprocity of benefits. The one bestows spiritual things, the other carnal things. The people feel their obligations to the man who instructs, guides, and comforts them in the way to heaven. They are impelled by a natural and proper feeling to contribute to the well-being of the minister from whom such benefits are received. And the pastor, on his part, is the more bound to the people of whose kind feeling he is daily receiving the expressions. This is a healthful and scriptural relationship. It was feared that it would be impaired by making the pastor independent of the people to whom he ministers. This objection is fully obviated by making the amount received from the general fund sufficient only for a support, and allowing it to be supplemented by the voluntary contributions of the people.

Thirdly. Admitting the obligation of the church as a whole to sustain the ministry, the great question is, How is this to be done? What plan or method should be adopted in order to discharge most effectually and justly this important duty? In answer to this question we propose to submit for the consideration of our brethren a general outline of the method adopted in the Free Church of Scotland.

The point about which the greatest diversity of judgment existed among the advocates of a sustentation fund was, whether there should be an equal dividend made of that fund, or, whether each pastor should receive from the fund an amount proportionate to the sum contributed by his congregation to it. It was proposed that that proportion should be one and a half more. If a church contributed thirty pounds, it would receive ninety; if it gave fifty, it would receive seventy-five; if one hundred, it would get back one hundred and fifty, which was to be regarded as the limit. No contribution from the fund was to be given to raise the salaries of those who received one hundred and fifty pounds, or seven hundred and fifty dollars. With us the limit might be fixed at eight hundred dollars, which is, considering the relative expense of living, a lower standard of support than that adopted in Scotland. Dr. Chalmers was very strenuous in his opposition to the plan of an equal dividend, which was adopted at the beginning. All the four hundred and seventy ministers, who came out from the Established

Church, received at first, and were to receive as long as they lived, an equal portion of the general fund. But when this rule was applied to their successors and to the pastors of new congregations, it awakened serious apprehensions. It was urged that if the same yearly allowance be made to every new minister, however little was received from his congregation, it would lead to such successive reductions of the dividend as must sooner or later involve the whole church in one common overthrow. Another objection was, that it would prevent church extension. No new enterprise could be started, or missionary sustained, except at an expense which, it was said, would be ruinous. Besides this, the congregations, it was assumed, needed the stimulus of the principle of getting only in proportion to what they gave. Notwithstanding the weight of these objections, the plan of an equal dividend has, we believe, been persevered in. This is the only rule consistent with principle. We are bound to sustain those whom we send to preach the gospel. We are not called upon to enrich them. They have renounced the world, and given themselves to the service of the Lord. But we are bound to support them. To an adequate support they have a right. The government does not send a regiment of soldiers to garrison a frontier fort in the wilderness, and require them to protect the country from the incursions of savages, to risk their lives and spend their strength, foregoing all opportunities of advancing their own interests, and then leave them to starve or shift for themselves. This cannot be done. And it is never attempted except in the sphere of religion, and by the church, by us calling ourselves Christians. There always will be men, blessed be God, who will preach the gospel, supported or unsupported, men who will labour and starve in silence, and break their hearts over the sufferings of wife and children, but this does not free the church from the guilt of injustice and cruelty. All that the Free Church contended for was that the church should sustain every faithful minister. As much as possible was to be secured for this purpose from the people to whom he preached. But if they were so besotted, so ignorant, or hardened that they would do little or nothing, they were not to be left to perish, nor were those who carried to them the word of life be left to starve.

We are bound to deal with them as we do with the heathen. We support ministers and churches, teachers and schools, among the Indians, even where the Indians contribute nothing to these objects, but we refuse to do this for our own fellow-citizens, and for the baptized members of our own church. We are not surprised, therefore, that the rule of an equal dividend, (*i. e.*, security for an adequate support,) was adhered to in the Free Church of Scotland. In connection with this system for sustaining pastors, there may be, and should be, a plan for the support of itinerant ministers, evangelists, whose adequate support may require a less sum than is needed for a settled pastor.

Assuming, then, that the church should aim at securing for every settled minister devoted to his work a salary, say, of eight hundred dollars a year, allowing every congregation to supplement that salary to any amount, and in any way it sees fit, the next question is, how is a fund adequate for that purpose to be raised? It is obvious that it cannot be done without thorough organization and constant supervision by the officers of the churches.

As already insisted upon, contributions must be sought from all classes of the people—from the poor as well as from the rich. All must coöperate in a scheme which contemplates the advantage of all, and the advancement of the kingdom of the common Lord of all. In Scotland every parish is divided into districts. Each district is assigned to a deacon or some other person to act as collector. This collector has a book containing the names of all persons connected with the congregation living in his district. It is his duty to call upon each individual, and ascertain how much each is willing to contribute during the year to the sustentation fund, and whether the subscribers prefer to pay weekly, monthly, or quarterly. It is his further duty to collect these subscriptions and to forward the amount to the Treasurer of the fund. Measures must of course be taken to organize and sustain this vast machinery. It will not rise of itself; nor will it continue in successful operation without constant supervision and stimulus. Hence the necessity of a Financial Committee or Central Agency. According to Dr. Chalmers the principles which should regulate the constitution of such a committee are, 1. That it should be com-

posed principally of laymen—men trained in counting-houses or "chambers of agency." 2. That it would be "monstrous impolicy in the church to confide altogether, or in very great proportion, so large an interest as her Sustentation Fund to the discretionary and unremunerated attendance even of her most zealous and best qualified adherents. There ought to be a greatly fuller paid agency, and with all the guaranties for a vigorous and punctual discharge of our business, which obtain in our national offices, or in any of the great trading establishments of the country. And first, in addition to a treasurer with the proper complement of clerks, there should be a Lay Superintendent, whose business it is, whether by personal visits, or by the emanations of a central correspondence, to keep the whole machinery of the Associations constantly and vigorously a going." "It is of the utmost importance to our financial prosperity, that we should have a Superintendent of thorough business ability and habits, under the control, at the same time, and surveillance of a Committee, mainly composed of business men." 3. There should also, he says, "be a Clerical Correspondent, who, besides seeing to the preparation and issue of tracts and circulars, charged with the high matters of principle and religious duty, should hold converse chiefly, if not exclusively, with the ministers of the Free Church. Without an office of this sort, both well filled and well executed, our present financial returns will not be increased, will not even be upholden. If left exclusively in the hands of secular men, the whole financial system will be secularized, after which it will infallibly go to pieces. Our's is essentially a religious operation for a religious object, and if separated from the religious principle by which it is kept in healthful and living play, then, as if bereft of its needful and sustaining aliment, it will wither into extinction in a few years." 4. He urges the appointment of agents to visit the Associations, putting them into action and good order, and setting up new ones. "This," he says, "is the true way of making the life-blood of our cause circulate from the heart to extremities of Scotland." "We do hope," he adds, "that these mighty advantages will reconcile the church to the expenses of a larger paid agency. There is a prejudice, I had almost said, a low-minded suspicion, on this subject, most

grievously adverse to the enlargement of the Church's resources and her means. The sum of two thousand pounds or even three thousand, and perhaps more, rightly expended on right men, would be remunerated more than fifty-fold by the impulse thus given to the mechanism of our Associations."

These views of a man so remarkable for his constructive genius as Dr. Chalmers, and so revered for his character and services, are submitted for the consideration of those who may favour the adoption of the plan of a sustentation fund for the ministry of our church.

Such is the general outline of the scheme. The considerations in favour of its adoption are briefly as follows:

1. It is practicable. What has been done, may be done. What has been carried out successfully for years in Scotland, may be carried out in America. It is true the work is far more extensive here than there, and has difficulties to encounter here which were not to be overcome there. But if our work be the more difficult, it is more necessary, and we have more men and greater resources, so that in proportion to the strength of the two bodies, the Free Church of Scotland had perhaps as heavy a burden to bear as can ever be imposed on us. That this plan of a general sustentation fund is practicable, is proved not only by the example of the Free Church, but also by that of the Methodists. Among that extensive and flourishing body of Christians, the minister is not made dependent on the particular church to which he preaches, but is sustained by the general funds of the body as a whole. This general fund is supplied in part from the weekly contributions of the members, and partly from the profits of their extensive "book concern." How efficient this scheme has proved in their hands, is proved by the experiment both in England and America. In answer to the cavil that the plan of a general contribution was "a proposal to grind the faces of the poor for the support of an ecclesiastical system," Dr. Chalmers says, "These reasoners would be puzzled to understand how it is that the Methodists of England, many of them in humble life, give their shilling a month, or even their six-pence a week, for the maintenance of the gospel. Why, after all, they form the best conditioned and most prosperous community in the empire. The truth is, that

instead of what they give being extracted from the earnings of their hard and honest industry, it were far more correct to say, in reference to the great majority of their converts, that what they give is the spontaneous tribute of but a fraction from the squanderings of their former extravagance." Presbyterians of this country, it is hoped, will not be disposed to pronounce impracticable what has been actually accomplished by their brethren in Scotland, and by other bodies of believers both in Europe and America.

2. Another consideration in favour of this plan, is that it is only the application to the home-field of the principle on which we act in the foreign field. When we send a missionary to the heathen, it is not on his own charges. We do not tell him to gather his support from the people to whom he carries the gospel, or sustain himself as he best can. We know that the heathen cannot, or will not support him; and we know that if required to support himself either in whole or in part, his efficiency as a missionary would be impaired or destroyed. We therefore pledge the faith of the church that he shall be sustained. This is right; it is Christian; it is necessary. Why should not the same principle be acted upon at home? Souls here are as valuable as the souls of the heathen. The necessity of a pastor supporting himself is as inconsistent with his efficiency here as it is abroad: it is as much in contravention of the command of Christ and of the spirit of the gospel in the one case as in the other. The suffering entailed by the neglect of this duty is as great in this country as it would be anywhere else.

3. Another great recommendation of a sustentation fund is that it would enable the church to secure the service of the numerous ministers who are now unoccupied. What that number is we are unable accurately to determine. The estimates which we have seen vary so much that they cannot be relied upon. The lowest estimate places the number at several hundred. Whenever a vacancy occurs in a self-sustaining church, the pulpit is crowded with candidates. Many men in the prime of life, of high culture and attainments, are obliged to seek for months, or even years, before they can find a field of labour to which they feel authorized to take their families.

From these facts some have inferred that the ministry is overstocked, that the supply exceeds the demand, and they therefore call for curtailing the number of ministers and candidates. These men know not what they do. The complaint is not that the church is overrun by unconverted or incompetent ministers; but that we have too many really pious and well qualified men in the sacred office. Those who make this objection profess to believe that the Holy Ghost as truly calls men to the ministry as he calls them to faith and salvation. The church through her appropriate organs solemnly declares, that, in her judgment, every man whom she ordains, is called of God to the ministry of the word. As the complaint is not of remissness, or want of fidelity on the part of the presbyteries, it is in fact a complaint against the Holy Spirit. He has been too lavish in his calls. If this is revolting; if this shocks every Christian's mind, it is not our fault. We simply put into plain English the real meaning of those who complain that we have too many faithful and well qualified men in the ministry. What is true in this matter, and all that is true, is, that we have more ministers than we have self-sustaining churches; more men whom God has called to preach the gospel, than the church is willing to support. There is the difficulty. If we should do our duty, we would find that God would multiply the ministry ten-fold, and increase an hundred-fold the ability and willingness of the church to support them all. It is difficult for the individual to obtain Christian symmetry of character. Some are prominent for one virtue and deficient in another. So it is with churches. Some are more devoted to the care of the poor than to foreign missions; some to education than to sustentation. What is needed is, not that the work well done should be neglected, but that what has been neglected should be properly attended to. If we, as a church, have prayed more, and laboured more, in order that God would send labourers into his harvest, than that he would give his people wisdom and liberality to provide for their support, we should not complain that he has answered our prayers, but seek for grace to turn his gifts to advantage.

The objection that the ministry is overstocked can be made by those only who forget that the field is the world; that Christ

has commanded us to preach the gospel to every creature. In some of our cities there are half a million of men who are living almost in the darkness of heathenism. Every unemployed minister in our church could be profitably employed in two such crowded places as New York and Philadelphia. And while these thousands have no one to care for their souls, men complain that we have too many ministers! Two-thirds of the human family have never heard of Christ. In many lands to which we have sent missionaries there is not one minister to a million of people. It is a strange thing therefore to hear from the lips of Christians that God has given his church too many preachers. What we want is the heart to support them. There is room for ten times as many faithful ministers as we now have. Even in our land, in some large states, the proportion of our ministers to the population is less now than it was ten years ago. And the records show that all the graduates of all our seminaries would be required in some of the Western States to keep the proportion of ministers to the people what it is at the present time; to say nothing of the constant losses by death, and to the demands of other portions of the land. If the church could be brought to resolve to give an adequate support to every minister able and willing to work, we should soon find that the number of such ministers was too small and not too large. The sin therefore that so many qualified men fail to find employment rests on the church.

4. Another consideration in favour of a sustentation fund is, that it is necessary to render the church aggressive. We are falling behind other denominations. In our cities and towns the Episcopalians are eating us out. In other places the Baptists, Congregationalists, or Methodists, are occupying the ground. We rejoice in the progress of these churches. In every way Christ is preached. But we have our duty to perform, and our part to do in the work of advancing the kingdom of God. Our candlestick will be removed out of its place, unless that duty be performed. The Secretary of the Board of Missions, in his last communication to the churches (Dec. 1865), says: "The requisitions of the past year have not been met. New fields could have been entered, new territories secured, and our church been represented in the advance of that great tide

of population which rolls across the continent." The demand for ministers, he tells us, is above the supply; directly the reverse of what some of our religious journals are striving to make our people believe. "Unless," says the Secretary, "the Lord of the harvest furnish the labourers, the harvest, so far as our church is concerned, will be ungathered,—golden opportunities will be lost." "We have not the men." "There are men," he tells us, "who hover around vacancies . . . but men glowing with missionary zeal we have not." "Great and precious revivals of religion can only remedy this great and serious evil. Earthly sacrifices are not counted by earnest hearts, who have received the baptism; men of whom our fathers have told us, counted it an honour to suffer for Christ—men who laid the foundations of our church in the early history of our country." It thus appears that important fields are constantly presenting which we cannot occupy. The reason is, that we have not the men who are willing to go. There are men enough to hover around vacancies, but not men of "missionary zeal," "of earnest hearts;" men "willing to suffer for Christ." The whole fault of the failure of the church to do her duty to Christ and the world, is thus thrown upon the ministers. There is another side to this question. The ministers thus complained of give as much evidence of zeal and willingness to suffer as the rest of us. They are willing to go if they are supported; we are not willing to support them. We say, Go and suffer. It is an honour to suffer. If you had a proper spirit you would not shrink from "these earthly sacrifices." Now it is very plain that it is no more their duty to go, than it is our duty to sustain them. They are no more called to make the sacrifice of leaving home and friends, and early associations, and to encounter all the trials incident to a new mode of life, and to labouring among the ignorant and destitute, than we are to make the sacrifice of so increasing our contributions to the missionary fund, as to secure an adequate support to those whom we send to labour and suffer in our stead and to do our work. Until we do our duty, we are not in a state of mind to reprove the negligence or want of zeal of others. Until we take the beam out of our own eye, we cannot see clearly to take the mote out of our brother's eye. There may be, and doubtless there

is, in the ministry a lack of the zeal and devotion which they ought to possess. That they will be the first to acknowledge, and we may all join in the same humiliating confession. But this is not the real difficulty. The blame is not with the ministers. It is with the church. If the church refuses to comply with the command of Christ and provide an adequate support for those whom she sends into the field, she has no right to turn round and upbraid them with the want of zeal. Hear what the Spirit says by the mouth of the apostle, "Have we not the right to eat and to drink? Have we not the right to lead about a wife? Have we not the right to forbear working? Who goeth a warfare at his own charges? Doth not the law say the same thing? for Moses said, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn." If men support the brutes who labour in their service, shall they refuse to support their Christian brethren whom they send to labour for the church and for their divine Master? Surely the lips of the church should be sealed until we are willing to perform a duty so clearly commanded and so self-evidently obligatory.

We are slow to believe that our ministers are less zealous or self-sacrificing than the Romish priests, or than the Methodist clergy. They go everywhere. They plant firm feet on all unoccupied territory. Not because they have more zeal, but because they have a church behind them. They are sure of being sustained. They know that they will not be allowed to struggle single-handed, uncheered and unsupported. We find men willing to go to the heathen, because they know they will not be called upon to support themselves or to suffer for the necessaries of life. If therefore the church would do her duty in this matter and secure an adequate support to every minister whom she sends into the field, she would, we are persuaded, have little reason to complain of the want of a missionary spirit in the clergy. At any rate we are bound to do our duty.

It is obvious also that a competent sustentation fund would greatly increase the efficiency of the church. It would redeem from secular pursuits all that portion of time which ministers have now to devote to securing the means of support. Taking the ministry as a whole, it is probable, one-third of their time

is necessarily taken from their official duties for that purpose. We may also reasonably hope for a corresponding increase of their spirituality. At least the excuse for engaging in worldly pursuits would be taken away, and greater responsibility would be imposed. All the institutions of the church would have increased stability and permanence, where they are now occasional, uncertain, and ever changing. We should present an ever-advancing front. Congregations too feeble to support the gospel at all, under this steady culture, would soon be able not only to sustain themselves, but to aid in sustaining others. A new spirit of alacrity and confidence would be infused into the ministry. The church itself would feel a new life in all its parts. It would renew its strength by the exercise of the graces of liberality and devotion to its divine Head, and if the principles which Paul lays down in 2 Cor. ix. 8, is still to be relied upon, it would grow in wealth in proportion as it increased in the bountifulness of its benefactions. There is no surer way of securing the Divine favour, than the faithful performance of duty.

Many objections, more or less formidable, will doubtless be urged against the plan of a sustentation fund. It may be objected that making a pastor independent of his congregation will render him idle. If secure of a support, whether he works or not, he will be sorely tempted to neglect his work. To this it may be answered, 1. That this supposes the minister to be without conscience and without any true devotion to his Master's service. We have greater security against the admission of unworthy men into the ministry than we have against the admission of unworthy members into the church. Such cases will always occur, but to reject a great and necessary scheme, because perfection cannot be secured in its operation, would be unwise. 2. The pastor, even when sustained by a general fund, is not independent of his congregation. The fund can yield him little more than the necessaries of life; and that supply would soon be cut off in cases of persistent neglect of duty. 3. The Methodist clergy, although sustained by a general fund, are faithful and laborious. The same is true of the ministers of the Free Church, and of the clergy of Prussia. The latter are sustained by the government and go through the

laborious parish duties imposed upon them with the regularity of clock-work. Indeed, all the officers of the government, civil and military, are independent of those whom they immediately serve. Our foreign missionaries are faithful and devoted men although sustained by the church at home. We may surely dismiss this objection as derogatory not only to the ministry, but to the promise and grace of Christ. A more serious objection may be founded on the largeness of the sum which it will be necessary to raise. In answer to this it may be said, 1. That sums proportionably large are raised by other churches. 2. That all that is needed to make this burden light is its equal distribution, to be secured by a thorough and efficient organization. How readily were millions of money raised during the war to alleviate the bodily wants of our soldiers. The souls of men can suffer more than their bodies. The greatest difficulties to be encountered will doubtless arise from the undue multiplication of churches. This is a great evil already. In a population not able to sustain more than one church, there are often five or six, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Methodist, Baptist, and Roman Catholic, and that too where there is little or no prospect of growth. The principle should be adopted that a pastor is not to be permanently sustained in any place where the people have access to other evangelical churches, unless he has an adequate field of labour. There must be a rigid supervision as to this matter exercised by not only the Presbyteries, but by the Central Committee, and by the General Assembly.

Notwithstanding these and other objections and difficulties, we believe that if we could secure the services of some man of the executive power of George H. Stuart, of Philadelphia, who made the Christian Commission what it was, the plan of a sustentation fund could be carried into successful operation in the course of a very few years. Then we should stand erect again, with our loins girded, and our feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace.

ART. II.—*Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Boston*, 1864. 412 pp. 8vo.

IF the style and character of an Annual Report are any index to the character of the thing reported, there is in this volume a strong presumption certainly in favour of the excellence of the Boston schools. No city in this country, no state, so far as we are aware, sends forth more complete reports, whether we regard the fulness and exactness of the information contained, the clearness and method of the arrangement, or the typographical beauty of their appearance. The report for 1864, for a copy of which we are indebted to John D. Philbrick, Esq., Superintendent of the Boston public schools, is a large octavo volume, of more than four hundred pages, printed with inviting type, on fair paper, handsomely bound, and seems to contain an answer to almost every question which a stranger might wish to ask concerning the progress and the present condition of the schools. It is indeed a model report, and we have reason to believe that it is only a fair exponent of the institutions which it represents.

It is not our intention, however, at this time, to speak of the schools of Boston, but to take the occasion to express some views in regard to the general subject of education by means of common schools. The argument for popular education is familiar and trite, and yet it needs to be occasionally re-stated and enforced. There is no community in which there is not a considerable number of persons grossly and dangerously ignorant, and there are many communities in which the majority of the people are in this condition. There is no community in which the importance of general education is over-estimated; there are unfortunately many communities in which education is held to be the least important of public interests. A brief discussion of the subject, therefore, can never be entirely out of place.

Before proceeding to the direct argument, let us notice some of the most common objections.

It is a not uncommon opinion, that the business of education should be left, like other kinds of business, to the laws of trade. It is said, if a carpenter is wanted in any community, or a blacksmith, or a tailor, or a lawyer, or a doctor, carpenters, blacksmiths, tailors, lawyers and doctors will make their appearance. If a store is wanted, a store will spring up. Why not a school house? Those who use this argument forget the essential difference between the two classes of wants to be supplied. All men equally feel the distress, if naked, or hungry, or sick, or suffering from any material want. The poor man, no less than the rich, feels the pinchings of hunger, and will exert himself to remedy the evil. The sick man, even more than the well, appreciates the value of medicine and the necessity of a physician. Not so in the matter of knowledge. A man must himself be educated, to understand the value of education. There are exceptions, of course. Yet it is substantially true, that the want of education is not one of those felt and pinching necessities that compel men's attention, and that consequently may be left to shift for themselves. A man who has himself enjoyed the blessing of a good education, expects to provide schools for his children, as much as he expects to provide for them food and clothing. The wants of their minds are to him pressing realities, as much as are the wants of their bodies. Not so with the ignorant and debased neighbours, who live within stone's throw of his dwelling. They, from their own experience, know nothing better, and are quite content, both for themselves and their children, to live on in the debased condition in which we see them. If these wretched creatures are ever moved to seek a higher style of living and being, the movement must originate outside of themselves. It is a case in which the man of higher advantages must think and act for those below him. It is a case in which people have a pressing need without knowing it, and in which consequently the laws of supply and demand do not meet the emergency.

Another common opinion on this subject is that private enterprise is adequate to meet the want. Private enterprise in education is not indeed to be discarded. Where the community as a whole, in its organized capacity, will do nothing, let individuals do what they can. In such cases, let those who

appreciate the advantages of education, concert measures for the establishment of schools and the employment of teachers, and for inducing parents who are indifferent to send their children. By these private efforts, the community may be gradually awakened to the importance of the subject, and so be induced to take it up on their own account. But private benevolence is not sufficient for so great a work. Private benevolence besides is apt to be fitful. It is at best subject to interruption by death and by reverses of fortune, while the cause is one which especially demands steadiness and continuity. The means for educating a community or a city should no more be subject to interruption, than the means of lighting it, or of supplying it with water.

The argument for depending upon private enterprise for devising and providing the means for popular education, would apply equally well to matters of police, and to the protection of property. The strong armed and the sagacious can take care of themselves. The stout hearted and the good, by due concert and combination, could keep criminals in some check, even in a country where there were no courts of justice, or prisons, or detective police. But this is not the ordinary or the best mode of accomplishing the end, nor could it in any case be thoroughly efficient. The restraint and punishment of crime belong to society as a whole, in its sovereign capacity. To the same society belongs the duty of seeing that its members do not fall into degrading ignorance and vice. God, in ordaining human society, had something higher in view than merely providing for the punishment of crime. Our Heavenly Father would have his children raised to the full enjoyment of their privileges as social and rational beings, and he seems to have established society for this very end, among others, that there may be an agency and a machinery adequate and fitted to drag even the unwilling out of the mire into which they have fallen. Without such an interposition on the part of society as a whole, the work will not be done. The mass of the people will remain in ignorance in every community, in which the community as such does not provide the means of education and general enlightenment.

It is often urged against common schools, that they tend to

impair parental obligation. Let us look this objection fairly in the face. The argument is stated as follows. If the community, in its organic capacity as a civil government, provides systematically for the instruction of the young, the system, just so far as it is successful and complete, does away with the necessity for any other provision. The parent, finding this work done to his hands, feels no necessity of looking after it himself, and so gradually loses all sense of obligation on the subject. Such a result, it is contended, is in contravention of the plainest dictates of nature and the most positive teachings of religion, both nature and religion requiring it as a primary duty of every parent to give his child a suitable education.

In meeting this objection, the friends of common schools agree with the objector to the fullest extent in asserting the imperative, universal, irrepealable duty of the parent to educate his own child. The duty is not the less binding on the parent, because a like duty, covering the same point, rests also on the community. The interests involved are so momentous, that God in his wise ordination has given them a double security. It is a case in which two distinct parties are both separately required to see one and the same thing done. It is like taking two endorsers to a note. The obligation of one endorser is not impaired, because another man equally with himself is bound for payment. If a child grows up in ignorance and vice, while God will undoubtedly hold the parent responsible, he will also not hold the community guiltless. Both parties will be guilty before him, both parties will be punished. A man is bound to maintain a certain amount of cleanliness about his habitation. If he fails to do so, and if in consequence of this failure the atmosphere around him becomes tainted and malarious, he and his will suffer. Disease and death will visit his abode. But the consequences will not end here. The infection will extend. The whole community will be affected by it. The whole community, equally with the individual, are bound to see that the cause of the infection is removed. The infection will not spare the community because the individual has generated it, nor will it spare the individual because the community has failed to remove it. Each party has a duty and a peril of its own in regard to the same matter.

The fact is, individuals and the community are so bound together, that on many points their obligations lie in coincident lines. The matter of education is one of these points. God has ordained the parental relation, and has implanted the parental affections, for this very reason, among others, that the faculties of the helpless young immortal may have due training and development,—that this development may not be left to chance, like that of a worthless weed, but may have the protection and guardianship which are the necessary birthright of every rational creature brought into being by the voluntary act of another. But God has ordained society also for this same end, among others, namely, that his rational creatures may have a compentent agency, bound by the laws and necessities of its own welfare to make adequate provision for the instruction and education of every human being. The one duty does not conflict with the other. The one obligation does not impair the other. Both lie in coincident lines.

But, as a question of fact, is it true, that common schools impair the sense of obligation in the minds of parents in regard to the duty of educating their children? We affirm the fact to be exactly the contrary. Those communities in which there are no common schools, and in which the people generally are in a state of deplorable ignorance, are precisely those in which the sense of parental obligation on this point is at the lowest ebb. Go to a region of country in which not one man in ten can read and write, and you will find that not one man in ten will care whether his children are taught to read and write. Those communities on the contrary which have the best and most complete system of common schools, and in which this system has prevailed longest and has taken most complete hold of the public mind, are the very ones in which individuals will be found most keenly alive to the importance of the subject, and in which a parent will be regarded as a monster, if his children are allowed to grow up uneducated.

The objection, therefore, has no foundation either in fact or in reason. There is moreover another consideration not to be overlooked. In this matter of education, it is after all but a small part which the school does for a child. The main part of the child's education always takes place at home, or at least,

out of school. We speak here of course of day schools. The teacher is at best only an aid to the parent, supplementing the influences of the home and the street. The child is taking lessons continually from the father and mother, whether they mean it or not. Every teacher knows how much more rapidly a child improves at school, whose parents are well educated, and how difficult it is to teach a child who at home lives in an atmosphere of profound ignorance. The mind of the one whose home is a region of darkness and intellectual torpor, will be dwarfed and distorted, no matter what the efforts of its teachers. The mind of the one, on the contrary, whose home is the abode of intellectual light, warmth, and sunshine, will have a corresponding growth and expansion at school. There is a continual unconscious tuition, good or bad, received from the very atmosphere of the family. Besides this, there is a great deal of direct, active duty to be performed by the parent in the education of the child. No matter how good the school, or how faithful the teacher, there always remains much to be done by the parent, even in regard to the school duties. The parent must see that lessons are prepared, that the child is properly provided with books, that the meal times and the other arrangements of the household are such as to help forward the child's studies. There are a hundred things which the father and mother can do to help or to hinder the work of the school. A child, whose parents give proper home supervision over his studies, will, other things being equal, make twice the progress of one whose parents give the matter no attention. The community, therefore, in establishing common schools, does by no means take the whole matter of education out of the hands of the parent. On the contrary, it still leaves with him the most important and necessary of the duties connected with the education of his children, while it gives him aids for the performance of the remaining duties, which no private means can ordinarily supply.

We come, however, to a much graver objection. It is urged against common schools, as organized in this country, that religious instruction is excluded from them, and that without this element they only tend to make educated villains. Education, it is said, without the restraining and sanctifying influ-

ences of religion, only puts into the hands of the multitude greater power for evil. If this objection is valid, the most enlightened and Christian communities of the world have made, and are making, an enormous mistake. Yet the objection is urged with seriousness by men whose purity of motive is above question, and whose personal character gives great weight to their opinions. The objection originated in England, where all attempts to make legislative provision for the education of the common people have been steadily resisted by a potential party in the established church. The arguments put forth in the English religious journals have been reproduced in the journals here, and have in many instances awakened the apprehensions of serious minded persons. It is worth while, therefore, to give the subject some distinct consideration.

In the first place, the facts are not exactly as stated by those making the objection. Though little direct religious instruction may be given in the common school, there is usually a large amount of religious influence. A great majority of the teachers of our common schools are professing Christians. Very many of them are among our most active Sabbath-school teachers. Now a truly godly man or woman, at the head of a school, though never speaking a word directly on the subject of religion, yet by the power of a silent, consistent example, exerts a continual Christian influence. In the next place, as a matter of fact, direct religious teaching is not entirely excluded from our public schools. We think, it by no means holds that prominent position in the course of study which it should hold. But it is not entirely excluded. The Bible, with very rare exceptions, is read daily in all our common schools. It is appealed to as ultimate authority in questions of history and morals. It is quoted for illustration in questions of taste. It is in many schools a text-book for direct study. In the third place, nine out of ten of the children of the week-day school attend the Sabbath-school. The Sabbath-school supplements the instructions of the week-day school. The case, therefore, is not that of an education purely intellectual. Moral and religious instruction accompanies the instruction in worldly knowledge. The Sabbath-school, the church, and the family, by their combined and ceaseless activities, infuse into

our course of elementary education a much larger religious ingredient than a stranger might suppose, who should confine his examination to a mere inspection of our common schools, or to the reading of the annual reports of our educational boards.

But apart from all these considerations, taking the question in its naked form, is it true that mere intellectual education has the tendency alleged? We do not believe it. The constitution of the human mind gives no warrant for such an inference. Recorded, indisputable facts, overwhelmingly disprove it. So far is it from being true that the mere diffusion of knowledge has a tendency to make men knaves and infidels, we believe the very opposite to be true. Knowledge is the natural ally of religion. To hold otherwise, is to disparage and dishonour religion—to imply, if not to say, that ignorance is the mother of devotion.

There is an inborn antagonism between the intellectual and the sensual nature of man. If you give to the intellect no development, you leave the senses as the ruling power. We see this strikingly illustrated in the idiotic, who are for the most part disgustingly sensual. Among a population grossly ignorant and uneducated, sensualism prevails in its most appalling forms. The man is a sensualist, simply because he knows no higher pleasures. He is degraded, because he has no motives to be otherwise. He is barely above a brute. The amount of crime, of the coarsest and most debasing character, among the uneducated peasantry of England, is almost incredible. Here is a description of an English peasant of the present day, given by a competent and unimpeached witness, himself an Englishman. We quote from a work on "The Social Condition and Education of the People of England," by Joseph Kay, Esq., of Trinity College, Cambridge, who was commissioned by the Senate of the University to travel for the purpose of examining into the social condition of the poorer classes. Says Mr. Kay, "You cannot address an English peasant, without being struck with the intellectual darkness which surrounds him. There is neither speculation in his eye nor intelligence in his countenance. His whole expression is more that of an animal than of a man. He is wanting too in the erect and independent bearing of a man. As a class, our peasants have no amuse-

ments beyond the indulgence of sense. In nine cases out of ten recreation is associated in their minds with nothing higher than sensuality. About one half of our poor can neither read nor write, have never been in any school, and know little, or positively nothing, of the doctrines of the Christian religion, of moral duties, or of any higher pleasures than beer drinking and spirit drinking, and the grossest sensual indulgence. They live precisely like brutes, to gratify, so far as their means allow, the appetites of their uncultivated bodies, and then die, to go they have never thought, cared, or wondered whither. Brought up in the darkness of barbarism, they have no idea that it is possible for them to attain to any higher condition; they are not even sentient enough to desire, with any strength of feeling, to change their situation; they are not intelligent enough to be perseveringly discontented; they are not sensible to what we call the voice of conscience; they do not understand the necessity of avoiding crime, beyond the mere fear of the police and the jail; they have unclear, indefinite, and undefinable ideas of all around them; they eat, drink, breed, work, and die; and while they pass through their brute-like existence here, the richer and more intelligent classes are obliged to guard them with police and standing armies, and to cover the land with prisons, cages, and all kinds of receptacles for the perpetrators of crime."

Surely it must be some hallucination of mind, which leads men to suppose that the diffusion of knowledge among such a population, even though it be only scientific and intellectual knowledge, can have any natural or general tendency adverse to religion and morals. Apart, however, from speculation, and as a pure question of fact, the recorded statistics of crime point unmistakably the other way. Criminal records the world over prove, beyond reasonable doubt, that the overwhelming majority of crimes are committed by persons deplorably ignorant. Intellectual education, therefore, we contend, even when deprived of its natural ally and adjunct, religious training, has no natural tendency to produce knaves and villains. On the contrary, it is a most efficient corrective and restraint of the evil and debasing tendencies of human nature. If the intellect is not so high a region in man's constitution as the moral

powers, which we readily grant, it is at least above the mere sensual part, in which vice and crime have their main-spring and aliment. The question fortunately is one susceptible of a direct appeal to facts. Who are the men and women that people our jails and prisons? Are they persons of education, or are they in the main persons deplorably ignorant? What is the record of criminal statistics on this point?

We will quote a few of these statistics, from a great mass of similar evidence lying before us.

Out of 252,544 persons committed for crime in England and Wales, during a series of years, 229,300, or more than 90 per cent., are reported as uneducated, either entirely unable to read and write, or able to do so only very imperfectly; 22,159 could read and write, but not fluently; and only 1085 (*less than one half of one per cent. of the whole*) were what we call educated persons.

In nine consecutive years, beginning with the year 1837, only 28 educated females were brought to the bar of criminal justice in England and Wales, out of 7,673,633 females then living in that part of the United Kingdom; and in the year 1841, out of the same population, not one educated female was committed for trial.

In a special commission, held in 1842, to try those who had been guilty of rioting and disturbance in the manufacturing districts, out of 567 thus tried, 154 could neither read nor write, 155 could read only, 184 could read and write imperfectly, 73 could read and write well, and only one had received superior instruction.

In 1840, in 20 counties of England and Wales, with a population of 8,724,338, there were convicted of crime only 59 educated persons, or one for every 147,870 inhabitants. In 32 other counties, with a population of 7,182,491, the records furnished *not one convict* who had received more than the merest elements of instruction.

In 1841, in 15 English counties, with a population of 9,569,064, there were convicted only 74 instructed persons, or one to every 129,311 inhabitants, while the 25 remaining counties and the whole of Wales, with a population of

6,342,661, did not furnish one single conviction of a person who had received more than the mere elements of education.

In 1845, out of a total of 59,123 persons taken into custody, 15,263 could neither read nor write, and 39,659 could barely read, and could write very imperfectly.

In the four best taught counties of England, the number of schools being one for every 700 hundred inhabitants, the number of criminal convictions was one a year for every 1108 inhabitants. In the four worst taught counties, the number of schools being one for every 1501 inhabitants, the number of convictions was one a year for every 550 inhabitants. That is, in one set of counties, the people were about twice as well educated as in the other, and one half as much addicted to crime. In other words, in proportion as the people were educated, were they free from crime.

Thrift and good morals usually keep pace with the spread of intelligence among the people. This has been the result in all those countries of Europe where good common schools are maintained, as in Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and most of the German States. Pauperism, with its attendant evils and crimes, is almost unknown in those countries, while in England, where the common people are worse educated than those of any Protestant nation in the world, pauperism has become an evil which her wisest statesmen have given up as unmanageable. In 1848, in addition to hundreds of persons assisted by charitable individuals, no less than 1,876,541 paupers (*one out of every eight of the population!*) were relieved by the boards of guardians of the poor, at an expense from the public purse of nearly thirty millions of dollars.

In our own country, the same pains have not been taken to collect statistics on this subject, because comparatively little controversy about it has existed here to call forth inquiry. We as a people have generally taken it for granted that popular education lessens crime and pauperism. Still, facts enough have been recorded to show the same results here as elsewhere. When an educated villain is convicted, like Monroe Edwards or Professor Webster, the fact becomes so notorious by means of

the press, that it is unconsciously multiplied in our imagination, and we think the instances more numerous than they really are. We never think of the scores of obscure villains that are convicted every week all the year round. A quotation or two from the facts which have been recorded, will be sufficient to satisfy us on this point.

In the Ohio penitentiary, out of 276 inmates, nearly all were reported as ignorant, and 175 as grossly so.

In the Auburn prison, New York, out of 244 inmates, only 39 could read and write.

In the Sing Sing prison, no official record has been made on this point. But the Rev. Mr. Luckey, for more than twenty years chaplain of the prison, is obliged by the prison regulations to superintend and read all the letters between the prisoners and their friends, and so he becomes personally acquainted with their condition in regard to education. He reported a few months since to the writer of these pages, that while there are always some among the convicts who have been educated, yet the great mass of them are stolidly ignorant. There are usually between one and two hundred learning to read, and this does not include the half of those who are unable to read, as the attendance upon the class is voluntary, the accommodations are meagre, and most of the prisoners are indifferent to their own improvement. Not five in a hundred can write otherwise than in the most clumsy and awkward manner, and with the grossest blunders in orthography, and not more than two in a hundred can write a sentence grammatically. Out of the 700 then in prison, only three were liberally educated, and two of these were foreigners.

Throughout the state of New York, in 1841, the ratio of uneducated criminals to the whole number of uneducated persons was twenty-eight times as great as the ratio of educated criminals to the whole number of the educated inhabitants.

In view of the facts which have been given, and which might be multiplied to almost any extent, it is not easy to avoid the conclusion that mere intellectual education has some power to restrain man from the commission of crime. Assuredly, ignorance and sin are natural adjuncts and allies.

Schools undoubtedly cost something. The community that undertakes to educate the masses, or the individual that undertakes to educate his children, must expect to have a serious bill to pay. It is a pernicious folly to inculcate the contrary. The advocate of popular education, who tries to persuade people into the experiment, under the assurance that the expense will be trifling, misleads his readers, and puts back the cause which he would fain put forward. But there is a most significant *per contra* in the account, and on this there is no danger of dwelling too much. Nothing is so costly as crime, and no preventive of crime is more efficient than education. Schoolhouses are cheaper than jails, teachers and books are a better security than handcuffs and policemen. There are educated villains, it is true. But they are rare, and they attract the greater attention by the very fact of their rarity. But go into a prison, or a criminal court, or a police court, and see who they are that mainly occupy the proceedings of our expensive machinery of criminal justice. Nine-tenths of those miserable creatures are in a state of most deplorable ignorance. Degraded, sensual, with no knowledge of anything better than the indulgence of the lowest passions, without mental resources, or any avenue to intellectual enjoyment, they often resort to crime from sheer want of something better to do. When Dr. Johnson was asked, "Who is the most miserable man?" his reply was, "The man who cannot read on a rainy day." There is profound meaning in the answer. The man who has been educated, who not only can read, but has acquired a taste for reading, and for reading of a proper kind, is rarely driven into low and debasing crime. He has resources within himself, which are a counterpoise to the incitements of his animal nature. His awakened intellect and conscience also make him understand more clearly the danger and guilt of a life of crime. Many of the deeds which swell the records of our criminal courts spring from poverty, as every criminal lawyer well knows, and there is no remedy against extreme poverty so sure as education. The old adage says that knowledge is power. It is also wealth. A man with even an ordinary, common school education, can turn himself in a hundred ways, where a

mere ignorant boor would be utterly helpless. The faculties are developed, ingenuity is quickened, the man's resources are enlarged. An educated man may be tempted to crime, but he is not driven into it, as hundreds are daily, by mere poverty, or by an intolerable hunger of the mind for enjoyment of some kind.

Schools, then, especially schools in which moral and religious truth is inculcated, are the most powerful means of lessening crime, and of lessening the costly and frightful apparatus of criminal administration. As schoolhouses and churches increase in the land, jails and prisons diminish. As knowledge is diffused, property becomes secure, and rises in value. A community, therefore, is bound to see that its members are properly educated, if for no other reason, in mere self-defence. The many must be educated, in order that the many may be protected. A great city is just as sacredly bound to provide for its teeming population the light of knowledge, as it is to provide material light for its streets. The one kind of illumination, equally with the other, is an essential part of its police. No matter what the cost, the dark holes and alleys must be flooded with the light of truth, before which the owls and bats and vampyres of society will be scattered to the winds. A great city without schools would be a hell,—a seething caldron of vice, impurity, and crime. No man of sound mind would choose such a place for the residence of himself and family, who had the means of living in any other place. If we could suppose two cities entirely equal in other respects, but in one of them a superior and costly system of free schools, while the other spent not a dollar upon schools, but depended solely upon the rigors of the law and the strong arm of avenging justice for restraining the ignorant and corrupt masses, can there be any doubt which city would be the safest and most desirable place of residence?

Whatever view of this subject may be taken in other countries, we in this country are shut up to the necessity of popular education. We at least have no choice. Universal suffrage necessitates universal education. If we do not educate our people, educate universally, educate wisely and liberally, we

can hardly expect to maintain permanently our popular institutions. The man's vote, who cannot read the names on the ballot which he throws into the box, counts just as much in deciding public affairs as yours, who are versed in statesmanship and political economy. He is a partner in the political firm. You can neither withdraw from the firm yourself, nor can you throw him out. In the absence of general education, this tremendous power of suffrage is something frightful to contemplate. "The greatest despotism on earth," says De Tocqueville, "is an excited, untaught public sentiment; and we should hate not only despots, but despotism. When I feel the hand of power lie heavy on my brow, I care not to know who oppresses me; the yoke is not the easier, because it is held out to me by a million of men."

The danger from this source is intensified by the immense immigration from abroad which is going on, and which bids fair very greatly to increase. The great majority of those who seek our shores, come here ignorant. With little knowledge of any kind, and with no knowledge whatever of the nature of republican institutions, these men, almost at once, are made sharers of the popular sovereignity, with all its tremendous powers of peace and war, order and anarchy, life and death. Not to have a system of public education, by which these ignorant and dangerous masses shall be enlightened, and shall be assimilated to the rest, and to the better part, of the population, is simply suicidal. Our national life hangs upon our common schools.

Besides this grave political consideration, affecting the interests of the entire body politic, and the question of the success and stability of our national institutions, there is another consideration coming home closely and individually to each man's personal interests. Where the law of trial by jury prevails, every citizen, whether educated or ignorant, takes part in the administration of justice. Twelve men, taken indiscriminately from the mass of the people, or if with any discrimination, taken more frequently from the lower walks of life than from the higher, are placed in a jury box to decide upon almost every possible question of human interests. The jury decides your fortune, your reputation. The jury says

whether you live or die. Go into a court of justice. Are they light matters which those twelve men are to determine? Look at the anxious faces of those whose estates, whose good name, whose worldly all, hangs upon the intelligence of those twelve men, or of any one of them. What assurance have you, save that which comes from popular education, that these men will understand and do their duty? Who would like to trust his legal rights or his personal safety to the verdict of a jury of Neapolitan lazzaroni?

In a few short years, the idle boys who are now prowling about the streets and alleys of our towns, the wharf-rats of our cities, will be a part of our jurymen. Is it of no consequence to me, whether their minds shall be early trained and disciplined, so that they will be capable of following a train of argument, or of comprehending a statement of facts? How is it possible to administer justice with any degree of fairness and efficiency, where the majority of those who are to constitute the jurymen and the witnesses are stolidly ignorant? By common law, every man has a right to be tried by his peers. Let law then provide that those shall, in some substantial sense, be my peers, on whose voice my all in life may depend.

But let us recur once more to the economical part of the argument. When a community is taxed for the support of common schools, the question naturally rises among the taxpayers, is the system worth the cost? Does the community, by the diffusion of knowledge and education, gain enough to counterbalance the large expense which such education involves? Even if this question could not be answered in the affirmative, it would not follow that common schools should be dispensed with. Common schools are needed as the best and cheapest protection against the crimes incident to an ignorant and degraded population. Common schools are right and proper, because without them the majority of those created in the image of God will never attain to that noble manhood which is their rightful inheritance. But the argument will receive additional force, if it can be shown that general education increases the wealth of the community.

That education does have this effect is evident, we think, from two independent lines of argument. First, an intelligent,

educated man is capable individually of achieving greater material results than one who is ignorant. Secondly, the general diffusion of intelligence through a community leads to labour-saving inventions, and thus increases its producing power.

In regard to the first line of argument, some curious and instructive facts were collected a few years since by the late Horace Mann. His inquiries were directed to the efficiency of operatives in factories, a class of men who would seem to require as little general intelligence as any kind of labourers. It was found that, as a general rule, those operatives who could sign their names to their weekly receipts for money, were able to do one-third more work, and to do it better, than those who made their mark. Nor is this at all to be wondered at. There is no kind of work, done by the aid of human muscle, that is purely mechanical. Mind is partner in all that the body does. Mind directs and controls muscle, and even in emergency gives it additional energy and power. No matter how simple the process in which an operative may be engaged, some cultivation of his mental powers is needed. Without it he misdirects his own movements, and mistakes continually the orders of his superintending workman. A boy who has been to a good common school, and has had his mental activities quickened, and whose mind has been stimulated and roused by worthy motives, not only will be more industrious for it when he becomes a man, but his industry will be more effective. He will accomplish more, even as a day labourer, than the mere ignorant boor. When we come to any kind of skilled labour, the difference between the educated and the ignorant is still more apparent. An intelligent mechanic is worth twice as much as one ignorant and stupid.

Many years ago a very instructive fact on this point came under our own personal observation. A gentleman of our acquaintance had frequent need of the aid of a carpenter. The work to be done was not regular carpentry, but various odd jobs, alterations and adaptations to suit special wants, and no little time and materials were wasted in the perpetual misconceptions and mistakes of the successive workmen employed. At length a workman was sent who was a German, from the

kingdom of Prussia. After listening attentively to the orders given, and doing what he could to understand what his employer wanted, Michael would whip out his pencil, and in two or three minutes, with a few rapid lines, would present a sketch of the article, so clear that any one could recognize it at a glance. It could be seen at once, also, whether the intention of his employer had been rightly conceived, and whether it was practicable. The consequence was, that so long as Michael was employed, there was no more waste of materials and time, to say nothing of the vexation of continual failures. Michael was not really more skilful as a carpenter than the many others who had preceded him. But his knowledge of drawing, gained in a common school in his native country, made his services worth from fifty cents to a dollar a day more than those of any other workman in the shop, and he actually received two dollars a day, when others in the same shop were receiving only a dollar and a quarter. He was always in demand, and he always received extra wages, and his work even at that rate was considered cheap.

What was true of Michael in carpentry, would be true of any other department of mechanical industry. In cabinet making, in shoe making, in tailoring, in masonry, in upholstery, in the various contrivances of tin and sheet iron with which our houses are made comfortable, in gas fitting and plumbing, in the thousand-and-one necessities of the farm, the garden, and the kitchen, a workman who is ready and expert with his pencil, who has learned to put his own ideas, or those of another, rapidly on paper, is worth fifty per cent. more than his fellows who have not this skill.

The example of this man was brought vividly to mind at a later day, in one of our large cities, when an important educational question was under discussion. Rembrandt Peale had two dreams, each worthy of his genius. One was to paint a Washington which should go down to posterity; the other was so to simplify the elements of the art of drawing, that young boys and girls might learn it as universally as they learn to read and write. He spent long years in maturing a little work for this purpose, no bigger than a primer or a spelling book, and a determined effort was made on the part of some of the

friends of popular education to introduce the study into the primary public schools of Philadelphia. It was introduced into some of the higher schools. But its benefits were limited to a comparatively small number. The hope and the aim of the friends of Mr. Peale's project were to make the study an elementary one—to make a certain amount of proficiency in drawing a test of promotion from the primary school to the schools above it. This would have placed "Graphics" along side of the copy-book and the spelling-book. After struggling for several years with popular prejudice, the friends of the scheme were obliged to abandon it as hopeless. The idea was too much in advance of the times. Could the plan have succeeded, and could the entire youthful population of that great city, which is preëminently a mechanical and manufacturing centre, have grown up with a familiar practised skill in the use of the pencil, in ordinary off-hand drawing, such as our friend Michael had, there can be no question that it would have added untold millions to the general wealth. If every boy and girl in that great metropolitan city were now obliged to spend as much time in learning to draw as is spent in learning to spell, and at the same age that they learn to spell, we do soberly believe that the addition to the wealth of the city, by the increased mechanical skill that would be developed, would be worth more than the entire cost of her public schools, although they do cost well nigh a million of dollars annually.

What is true of drawing, is true of every branch and accomplishment necessary to a complete education. A man is educated when all his capacities bodily and mental are developed, and a community is educated when all its members are. Now if we could imagine two communities, of exactly equal numbers, and in physical circumstances exactly equal as to climate, soil, access to markets, and so forth, and if one of these communities should tax itself to the extent of even one-fourth of its income in promoting popular education, while the other spent not a dollar in this way, there can be little doubt as to which community would make the most rapid advances in wealth and in every other desirable social good.

We happen to have on this subject one most striking and significant record. In 1670, the English Commissioners for

Foreign Plantations addressed to the Governors of the several colonies a series of questions concerning the condition of the settlements under their charge. One of these questions related to the means of popular education. The answers of two of the Governors are preserved. One of them, the Governor of Connecticut, ruled a territory to which nature had not been specially propitious. Its climate was bleak, its coast rock-bound, its soil blest with only ordinary fertility. The other territory, Virginia, had an extraordinary amount of natural advantages. It had fine harbors, numerous navigable streams, a climate more temperate by several degrees than its rival, the soil in its lowlands and valleys unsurpassed in any of the Plantations for its capacity to produce wheat, corn, and tobacco, its mountains filled with untold treasures of lime, iron, and coal, (and, it now seems, with petroleum also), and withal that wonderful variety of natural resources, which seems best suited to stimulate and reward the productive industry of its inhabitants.

The Governor of the less favoured colony replied to the Royal Commissioners, as follows: "*One-fourth* of the annual revenue of the Colony is laid out in maintaining free schools for the education of our children." The policy thus early impressed upon the colony has been maintained with steadfast and almost proverbial consistency to this day, that region being known the world over as the land of schoolmasters. The Governor of the other colony replied, "I thank God, there are no free schools, nor printing, and I hope we shall not have these hundred years." To this policy she also has only too faithfully adhered. Now what is the result?

By referring to the tables accompanying the Census of 1860, we find the following significant facts.

1. The average cash value of land was not quite $12 an acre in one commonwealth (Virginia), and a little over $36 an acre in the other.

2. One commonwealth sustained only five inhabitants to every hundred acres of her soil, the other sustained eighteen inhabitants to every hundred acres.

3. The value of all property, real and personal, averaged by

the population, was in one commonwealth $496 to every inhabitant, in the other $965 to every inhabitant.

4. The value of all property, real and personal, averaged by the acre, was in one commonwealth less than $26 to the acre, in the other more than $177 to the acre.

To which facts we may add, what is true, though not in the Census, it was the invention of Eli Whitney, a travelling schoolmaster from Connecticut, that has trebled the value of land in nearly every Southern State.

We have been endeavouring to show that popular education, though it is expensive, tends to national wealth. Our argument is that an educated population is capable of producing greater material results than a population uneducated can produce. The example of Eli Whitney, just referred to, suggests the other line of argument, which we will now notice briefly in conclusion. This second argument is, that the general diffusion of intelligence in a community tends to quicken invention, and leads to the discovery of those scientific principles and of those ingenious labour-saving machines, by which the productive power of the community is so greatly multiplied. The cotton-gin, the steam-engine, the sewing-machine, and the reaping-machine would never have been invented in a nation of boors. It is not asserted that every boy who goes to school will become an inventor. But it is as certain as the laws of mind and matter can make it, that inventions abound in a nation in proportion to its progress in science and the general spread of intelligence among the masses. Multiply common schools and you multiply inventions. How much these latter increase man's producing power, and so add to the aggregate of human wealth, it is needless to say. The invention of Watt alone has quadrupled the productive power of the whole human race. The aggregate steam power of one single country, Great Britain, equals the muscular capacity for labour of four hundred millions of men—more than twice the number of adult males capable of labour on our planet. Its aggregate power throughout the earth is equal to the male capacity for manual work of four or five worlds like ours. The commerce, the navigation, the maritime warfare, the agriculture, the mechanic

arts of the human race, have been revolutionized by this single invention not yet a century old.

The application of scientific truths to the common industries of life is becoming every day more and more a necessity. The village carpenter, no less than the builder of the Niagara Suspension Bridge, makes hourly reference to scientific laws. The carpenter who misapplies his formulæ for the strength of materials, builds a house which falls down. The properties of the various mechanical powers are involved in every machine. Every machine, indeed, it has been well said, is a solidified mechanical theorem. The surveyor in determining the limits of one's farm, the architect in planning a house, the builder in planning his estimates, and the several master workmen who do the carpentry, masonry, and finishing, are all dependent upon geometric truths. Bleaching, dyeing, calico-printing, gas-making, soap-making, sugar-refining, the reduction of metals from their ores, with innumerable other productive industries, are dependent upon chemistry. Agriculture, the basis of all the other arts, is in the same condition. Chemical knowledge, indeed, is doing for the productive powers of the soil what the application of steam has done for the increase of mechanical power. The farmer who wishes to double his crops, finds the means of doing so, not in multiplying his acres, but in applying a knowledge of the laws of chemistry to the cultivation of the soil already possessed. Even physiology is adding to the wealth of the farming interest. The truth that the production of animal heat implies waste of substance, and that therefore preventing the loss of heat prevents the need for extra food—which is a purely theoretical conclusion—now guides the fattening of cattle. By keeping cattle warm, fodder is saved. Experiments of physiologists have proved, not only that change of diet is beneficial, but that digestion is facilitated by a mixture of ingredients in each meal. Both these truths are now influencing cattle feeding. In the keen race of competition, the farmer who has a competent knowledge of the laws of animal and vegetable physiology and of agricultural chemistry, will surely distance the one who gropes along by guess and by tradition. A general diffusion of scientific knowledge saves the community from innumerable wasteful and foolish mistakes.

In England, not many years ago, the partners in a large mining company were ruined from not knowing that a certain fossil belonged to the old red sandstone, below which coal is never found. In another enterprise, £20,000 was lost in the prosecution of a scheme for collecting the alcohol that distils from bread in baking, all of which might have been saved, had the parties known that less than one hundredth part by weight of the flour is changed in fermentation.

But it is not necessary to multiply illustrations. Suffice it to say, in conclusion, we hold it to be a most manifest truth, that the general education of a community increases largely its material wealth, both by the direct effect which knowledge has upon individuals in making them individually more productive, and by the increased control which the diffusion of knowledge gives to mankind over the powers of nature. A nation or a state is wisely economical which spends largely and even lavishly upon popular education.

Art. III.—*The Patristic Doctrine on the Eucharist.*

The theology and piety of the early fathers are the common inheritance of all Christian churches. They laboured before the separation of the East from the West, and before the rise of the Papacy proper. What they taught and believed is of equal interest, although not of equal authority, for Protestants and Greek and Roman Catholics. With the Protestant, indeed, the first and last question in all matters of Christian faith and practice is: What says the word of God? In the Greek and Roman Church, this question is coördinate in principle, and subordinate in fact to the question, What says the church, which is the only safe and legitimate interpreter of the Bible? But no sound Protestant is on that account indifferent to the testimony of the church and the teaching of the fathers, provided only it be duly subordinated to that of the Scriptures. We cannot forget that the Bible itself has come down to us

through the channel of the Catholic Church; and that the fathers shaped many of the principal institutions of Christendom, and wrought out from the Bible those fundamental articles of faith in the Holy Trinity, and the Person of Christ, which are common to the Evangelical and Catholic confessions of faith.

As regards the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, the fathers have been often used and abused by different controversial writers in the interest of Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic, and the Zwinglian views on the subject. We shall endeavour to divest ourselves from all denominational and sectarian bias, and to give an objective historical statement of the views of the early church on this important subject.

The Eucharist is both a sacrament, wherein God conveys to us a certain blessing, and a commemorative sacrifice which man offers to God. As a sacrament, or the communion, it stands at the head of all sacred rites; as a commemorative sacrifice, it stands alone. The celebration of it under this twofold character forms the holy of holies of the Christian cultus in the ancient church, and to this day in the greater part of Christendom.

We consider first the doctrine of the Eucharist as a *sacrament*, then the doctrine of the Eucharist as a *sacrifice*, and finally the *celebration* of the eucharistic communion and eucharistic sacrifice.

I. *The Eucharist as a Sacrament.*

The doctrine of the sacrament of the Eucharist was not a subject of theological controversy and ecclesiastical action, till the time of Paschasius Radbert in the ninth century; whereas since then this feast of the Saviour's dying love has been the innocent cause of the most bitter disputes, especially in the age of the Reformation, between Papists and Protestants, and among Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists. Hence the doctrine of the ancient church on this point lacks the clearness and definiteness which the Nicene dogma of the Trinity, the Chalcedonian Christology, and the Augustinian anthropology and soteriology acquired from the controversies preceding them. In the doctrine of baptism also we have a much better

right to speak of a *consensus patrum*, than in the doctrine of the Holy Supper.

In general the fathers may be said to agree in the belief of the presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist. But the kind and mode of this presence are not yet particularly defined, and admit very different views: Christ may be conceived as really present either in and with the elements (consubstantiation, impanation), or under the illusive appearance of the changed elements (transubstantiation), or only dynamically and spiritually (the Calvinistic view).

In the ante-Nicene period we distinguish three views: the mystic view of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus; the symbolical view of Tertullian and Cyprian; and the allegorical or spiritualistic view of Clement of Alexandria and Origen. In the Nicene and post-Nicene age, the first view, which best answered the mystic and superstitious tendency of the time, preponderated, but the second also was represented by considerable authorities.*

I. The realistic and mystic view is represented by several fathers, and the early liturgies whose testimony we shall further cite below. They speak in enthusiastic and extravagant terms of the sacrament and sacrifice of the altar. They teach a real presence of the body and blood of Christ, which is included in the very idea of a real sacrifice, and they see in the mystical union of it with the sensible elements, a sort of repetition of the incarnation of the Logos. With the act of consecration a change accordingly takes place in the elements, whereby they become vehicles and organs of the life of Christ, although by no means necessarily changed into another substance. To denote this change they use very strong expressions, like *μεταβολή*, *μεταβάλλειν*, *μεταβάλλεσθαι*, *μετατυποῦσθαι*, *μεταποιεῖσθαι*, *mutatio*, *translatio*, *transfiguratio*, *transformatio*,†

* Rückert, in his Geschichte der Lehre vom Abendmahl, therefore divides the church-fathers on this point into two classes: the *Metabolical*, and the *Symbolical*. To this designation there are many objections. "Of the Synecdochian (Lutheran) interpretation of the words of institution the ancient church knew nothing." So says Kahnis, Luth. Dogmatik, ii. p. 221.

† But not yet the technical term *transsubstantiatio*, which was introduced by Paschasius Radbertus toward the middle of the ninth century, and the corresponding Greek term *μετουσίωσις*, which is still later.

and they appeal to the miraculous transformation of water into wine, the assimilation of food, and the pervasive power of leaven.

Cyril of Jerusalem goes further in this direction than any of the fathers. He plainly teaches some sort of supernatural connection between the body of Christ and the elements, though not necessarily a transubstantiation of the latter. Let us hear the principal passages.* "Then follows," he says in describing the celebration of the Eucharist, "the invocation of God, for the sending of his Spirit to make the bread the body of Christ, the wine the blood of Christ. For what the Holy Ghost touches, is sanctified and transformed." "Under the type of bread† is given to thee the body, under the type of the wine is given to thee the blood, that thou mayest be a partaker of the body and blood of Christ, and be of one body and blood with him."‡ "After the invocation of the Holy Ghost the bread of the Eucharist is no longer bread, but the body of Christ." "Consider therefore the bread and the wine not as empty elements, for they are, according to the declaration of the Lord, the body and blood of Christ." In support of this change, Cyril refers at one time to the wedding-feast at Cana, which indicates the Roman theory of change of substance; but at another to the consecration of the chrism, wherein the substance is unchanged. He was not clear and consistent with himself. His opinion probably was, that the eucharistic elements lost by consecration, not so much their earthly substance as their earthly purpose.

Gregory of Nyssa, though in general a very faithful disciple of the spiritualistic Origen, is on this point entirely realistic. He calls the Eucharist a food of immortality, and speaks of a

* Comp. especially his five mystagogical discourses, addressed to the newly baptized. Cyril's doctrine is discussed at large in Rückert, Des Abendmahl, sein Wesen u. seine Geschichte, p. 410, sqq. Comp. also Neander, Dogmengesch. i. p. 426, and in part against Rückert, Kahnis, Die Luth. Dogmatik, ii. p. 211, sq.

† Ἐν τύπῳ ἄρτου, which may mean either under the emblem of the bread (still existing as such), or under the outward form, sub specie panis. More naturally the former.

‡ Σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος αὐτοῦ.

miraculous transformation of the nature of the elements into the glorified body of Christ by virtue of the priestly blessing.*

Chrysostom likewise, though only incidentally in his homilies, and not in the strain of sober logic and theology, but of glowing rhetoric, speaks several times of a union of our whole nature with the body of Christ in the Eucharist, and even of a *manducatio oralis*.† Of the Latin fathers, Hilary,‡ Ambrose,§ and Gaudentius (A. D. 410) come nearest to the later dogma of transubstantiation. The latter says: "The Creator and Lord of nature, who produces bread from the earth, prepares out of bread his own body, makes of wine his own blood."‖

But closely as these and similar expressions verge upon the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, they seem to contain at most a *dynamic*, not a substantial, change of the elements into the body and the blood of Christ. For, in the first place, it must be remembered that there is a great difference between the half-poetic, enthusiastic, glowing language of devotion, in which the fathers, and especially the liturgies, speak of the eucharistic sacrifice, and the clear, calm, and cool language of logic and doctrinal definition. In the second place, the same fathers apply the same or quite similar terms to the baptismal water and the chrism of confirmation, without intending to teach a proper change of the substance of these material elements into the Holy Ghost. On the other hand they not rarely use concerning the bread and wine τύπος, ἀντίτυπα, *figura*, *signum*, and

* Orat. catech. magna, c. 37. Comp. Neander, l. c. i. p. 428, and Kahnis, ii. 213.

† Of an ἐμπῆξαι τοὺς ὀδόντας τῇ σαρκὶ καὶ συμπλακῆναι. Comp. the passages from Chrysostom in Ebrard and Rückert, l. c., and Kahnis, ii. p. 215, sqq.

‡ De Trinit. viii. 13, sq.

§ De Mysteriis, c. 8 and 9, where a *mutatio* of the *species elementorum* by the word of Christ is spoken of, and the changing of Moses' rod into a serpent, and of the Nile into blood, is cited in illustration. The genuineness of this small work, however, is doubted by many. Rückert considers Ambrose the pillar of the mediæval doctrine of the Supper.

‖ Serm. p. 42: "Ipse naturarum creator et dominus, qui producit de terra panem, de pane rursus, quia et potest et promisit, efficit proprium corpus, et qui de aqua vinum fecit, facit et de vino sanguinem." But on the other hand Gaudentius (bishop of Bripia) calls the Supper a *figure* of the passion of Christ, and the bread the *figure* (*figura*) of the body of Christ (p. 43).

like expressions, which denote rather a symbolical than a metabolical relation of them to the body and blood of the Lord. Finally, the favourite comparison of the mysterious transformation with the incarnation of the Logos, which in fact was not an annihilation of the human nature, but an assumption of it into unity with the divine, is of itself in favour of the continuance of the substance of the elements; else it would abet the Eutychian heresy.

II. The symbolical view, though on a realistic basis, is represented first by Eusebius, who calls the Supper a commemoration of Christ by the symbols of his body and blood, and takes the flesh and blood of Christ in the sixth chapter of John to mean the words of Christ, which are spirit and life, the true food of the soul, to believers.* Here appears the influence of his venerated Origen, whose views in regard to the sacramental aspect of the Eucharist he substantially repeats.

But it is striking, that even Athanasius, "the father of orthodoxy," recognized only a *spiritual* participation, a self-communication of the nourishing divine virtue of the Logos, in the symbols of the bread and wine, and incidentally evinces a doctrine of the Eucharist wholly foreign to the Catholic, and very like the older Alexandrian, and the Calvinistic, though by no means identical with the latter.† By the flesh and blood, in the mysterious discourse of Jesus, in the sixth chapter of John, which he refers to the Lord's Supper, he understands not the earthly, human, but the heavenly, divine manifestation of Jesus, a spiritual nutriment coming down from above, which

* Demonstr. evang. l. c. 10; Theol. eccl. iii. c. 12, and the fragment of a tract De paschate, published by Angelo Mai in Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, vol. i. p. 247. Comp. Neander, l. c. i. 430, and especially Steitz, art. on the early Greek doctrine of the Eucharist, in Deutsche Jahrbücher for 1865, p. 97—106.

† To this result H. Voigt comes, after the most thorough investigation, in his learned monograph on the doctrine of Athanasius, Bremen, 1861, p. 170—181, and since that time also Steitz, in his second article already quoted, l. c. p. 109 ff—127. Möhler finds in the passage Ad Serap. iv. 19, (the principal eucharistic declaration of Athanasius then known) the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Supper (Athanasius der Gr., p. 560, sqq.), but by a manifestly strained interpretation, and in contradiction with passages in the more recently known Festival Letters of Athanasius, which confirm the exposition of Voigt.

the Logos through the Holy Ghost communicates to believers (but not to a Judas, nor to the unbelieving).* With this view accords his extending of the participation of the eucharistic food to believers in heaven, and even to the angels, who, on account of their incorporeal nature, are incapable of a corporeal participation of Christ.†

Gregory Nazianzen sees in the Eucharist a type of the incarnation, and calls the consecrated elements symbols and antitypes of the great mysteries, but ascribes to them a saving virtue.‡

St. Basil, likewise, in explaining the words of Christ, "I live by the Father," (John vi. 57), against the Arians, who inferred from it that Christ was a creature, incidentally gives a spiritual meaning to the fruition of the eucharistic elements. "We eat the flesh of Christ," he says, "and drink his blood, if we through his incarnation and human life become partakers of the Logos and of wisdom."§

* So in the main passage, the fourth Epistle to Serapion (Ad Serap. iv. 19), which properly treats of the sin against the Holy Ghost (c. 8—23), and has been variously interpreted in the interest of different Confessions, but now receives new light from several passages in the recently discovered Syriac Festival Letters of Athanasius, translated by Larsow, Leipzig, 1852, p. 59, 78 sqq., 153 sqq., and especially p. 101.

† In the Festival Letters in Larsow p. 101, Athanasius says: "And not only, my brethren, is this bread [of the Eucharist] a food of the righteous, and not only are the saints who dwell on earth nourished with such bread and blood, but also in heaven we eat such food; for even to the higher spirits and the angels the Lord is nutriment, and he is the delight of all the powers of heaven, to all he is all, and over every one he yearns in his love of man."

‡ Orat. xvii. 12; viii. 17; iv. 52. Comp. Ullmann's Gregor. v. Naz. p. 483—488. Neander, l. c. i. p. 431, and Steitz in Dorner's Jahrbücher for 1865, p. 133–141. Steitz makes Gregory an advocate of the symbolical theory.

§ Epist. viii. c. 4 (or Ep. 141 in the older editions): *Τρώγομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνομεν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα κοινωνοὶ γινόμενοι διὰ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς ζωῆς τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς σοφίας. Σάρκα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν μυστικὴν ἐπιδημίαν* [*i. e.*, a spiritual incarnation or his internal coming to the soul, as distinct from his historical incarnation], *ὠνόμασε καὶ τὴν ἐκ πρακτικῆς καὶ φυσικῆς καὶ θεολογικῆς συνεστῶσαν διδασκαλίαν, δι' ἧς τρέφεται ψυχὴ καὶ πρὸς τῶν ὄντων θεωρίαν παρασκευάζεται.* This passage overlooked by Klose, Ebrard, and Kahnis, but noticed by Rückert, and more fully by Steitz (l. c. p. 127 ff.), is the principal one in Basil on the Eucharist, and must regulate the interpretation of the less important allusions in his other writings.

Macarius the elder, a gifted representative of the earlier Greek mysticism (A. D. 390), belongs to the same symbolical school, he calls bread and wine the antitype of the body and blood of Christ, and seems to know only a spiritual eating of the flesh of the Lord.*

Theodoret, who was acknowledged orthodox by the council of Chalcedon, teaches indeed a transformation (μετα,βάλλειν) of the eucharistic elements by virtue of the priestly consecration, and an adoration of them, which certainly sounds quite Romish, but in the same connection expressly rejects the idea of an absorption of the elements in the body of the Lord, as an error akin to the Monophysite. "The mystical emblems of the body and blood of Christ," says he, "continue in their original essence and form, they are visible and tangible as they were before [the consecration]:† but the contemplation of the spirit and of faith sees in them that which they have become, and they are adored also as that which they are to believers."‡

Similar language occurs in an Epistle to the monk Cæsarius, ascribed to Chrysostom, but perhaps not genuine:§ in Ephraim of Antioch, cited by Photius: and even in the Roman bishop Gelasius at the end of the fifth century (492–496).

* Hom. xxvii. 17, and other passages. Steitz (l. c. p. 142), enters more fully into the views of this monk of the Egyptian desert.

† Dial. ii., Opera, ed. Hal. tom. iv. p. 126, where the orthodox man says against the errorist: Τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα . . . μένει ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἴδους, καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι καὶ ἁπτά, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν.

‡ Προσκυνεῖται ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται. These words certainly prove that the consecrated elements are regarded as being not only subjectively, but in some sense objectively and really what the believer takes them for, namely, the body and blood of Christ. But with this they also retained, according to Theodoret, their natural reality and their symbolical character.

§ Ep. ad Cæsarium monach. (in Chrys. Opera, tom. iii., Pars altera, p. 897 of the new Paris ed. of Montfaucon after the Benedictine): "Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus: divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis; dignus autem habitus dominici corporis appellatione, *etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit*, et non duo corpora, sed unum corpus Filii prædicamus." This epistle is extant in full only in an old Latin version.

The latter says expressly in his work against Eutyches and Nestorius: "The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which we receive, is a Divine thing, because by it we are made partakers of the Divine nature. Yet the substance or nature of the bread and wine does not cease. And assuredly the image and the similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the performance of the mysteries."*

It is remarkable that Augustine, in other respects so decidedly catholic in the doctrine of the church and of baptism, and in the cardinal points of the Latin orthodoxy, follows the older African theologians, Tertullian and Cyprian, in a symbolical theory of the Supper, which however includes a real spiritual participation of the Lord by faith, and in this respect stands nearest to the Calvinistic or orthodox Reformed doctrine, while in minor points he differs from it as much as from transubstantiation and consubstantiation.† He was the first to make a clear distinction between the outward sign and the inward grace, which are equally essential to the conception of the sacrament. He maintains the figurative character of the words of institution, and of the discourse of Jesus on the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood in the sixth chapter of John; with Tertullian, he calls the bread and wine "*figuræ* or *signa* corporis et sanguinis Christi" (but certainly not *mere* figures), and insists on a distinction between "that which is visibly received in the sacrament, and that which is spiritually eaten and drunk," or between a carnal, visible manducation of

* De duabus naturis in Christo adv. Eutychen et Nestorium (in the Bibl. Max. Patrum, tom. viii. p. 703,) . . . . "et tamen esse non desinit *substantia* vel *natura* panis et vini. Et certe *imago* et *similitudo* corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur." Many Roman divines, through dogmatic prejudice, doubt the genuineness of this epistle. Comp. the Bibl. Max. tom. viii. p. 699—700.

† From his immense dogmatic authority Augustine has been an apple of contention among the different Confessions in all controversies on the doctrine of the Supper. Albertinus (De euchar. p. 602—742) and Rückert (l. c. p. 353, sqq.) have successfully proved that he is no witness for the Roman doctrine; but they go too far when they make him a mere symbolist. That he as little favours the Lutheran doctrine, Kahnis (vom Abendmahl, p. 221, and in the second part of his Luth. Dogmatik, p. 207,) frankly concedes.

the sacrament, and a spiritual eating of the flesh of Christ and drinking of his blood.* The latter he limits to the elect and the believing, though in opposition to the subjectivism of the Donatists, he asserts that the sacrament (in its *objective* import) is the body of Christ even for unworthy receivers. He says of Judas, that he only ate the bread of the Lord, while the other apostles "ate the Lord who was the bread." In another place: The *sacramentum* "is given to some unto life, to others unto destruction;" but the *res sacramenti*, *i. e.*, "the thing itself of which it is the sacramentum, is given to every one who is partaker of it, unto life." "He who does not abide in Christ, undoubtedly neither eats his flesh nor drinks his blood, though he eats and drinks the sacramentum (*i. e.*, the outward sign) of so great a thing to his condemnation." Augustine at all events lays chief stress on the spiritual participation. "Why preparest thou the teeth and the belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten!"† He claims for the sacrament religious reverence, but not a superstitious dread, as if it were a miracle with a magical effect.‡ He also expressly rejects the hypothesis of the ubiquity of Christ's body, which had already come into use in support of the materializing view, and has since been further developed by Lutheran divines in support of the theory of consubstantiation. "The body with which Christ rose," says he, "he took to heaven, which must be in a place . . . . . We must guard against such a conception of his divinity as destroys the reality of his flesh. For when the flesh of the Lord was upon earth, it was certainly not in heaven; and now that it is in heaven, it is not upon earth." "I believe that the body of the Lord is in heaven, as it was upon earth when he

* In Psalm. iii. 1: "Convivium, in quo corporis et sanguinis sui *figuram* discipulis commendavit." Contra Adamant. xii. 3 ("*signum* corporis sui"); Contra Advers. legis et prophet. ii. c. 9; Epist. 23; De Doctr. Christ iii. 10, 16, 19; De Civit. Dei, xxi. c. 20, 25; De peccat. mer. ac rem. ii. 26 ("*quamvis non sit corpus Christi*, sanctum est tamen, quoniam sacramentum est").

† Tract. in Joh. 25; "Quid paras dentes et ventrem? *Crede*, et manducasti." Comp. Tract. 26: "Qui non manet in Christo, *nec manducat carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem*, licet premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi."

‡ De Trinit. iii. 10: "Honorem tamquam religiosa possunt habere, stuporem tamquam mira non possunt."

ascended to heaven."* Yet this great church teacher at the same time holds fast to the real presence of Christ in the supper. He says of the martyrs: "They have drunk the blood of *Christ*, and have shed their *own* blood for Christ." He was also inclined, with the Oriental fathers, to ascribe a saving virtue to the consecrated elements.

Augustine's pupil, Facundus, taught that the sacramental bread "is not properly the body of Christ, but contains the mystery of the body." Fulgentius of Ruspina held the same symbolical view, and even at a much later period we can trace it through the mighty influence of Augustine's writings in Isidore of Sevilla, the venerable Beda, among the divines of the Carlovingian age, in Ratramnus, and Berengar of Tours, until it broke forth in a modified form with greater force than ever in the 16th century, and took permanent foothold in the Reformed churches.

Pope Leo I. is sometimes likewise numbered with the symbolists, but without good reason. He calls the communion a "spiritual food,† as Athanasius had done before, but supposes a sort of assimilation of the flesh and blood of Christ by the believing participation. "What we believe, *that* we receive with the mouth . . . . The participation of the body and blood of Christ causes that we pass into that which we receive, and bear Christ in us in spirit and body." Voluntary abstinence from the wine in the supper was as yet considered by this pope a sin.‡

III. The old liturgies, whose testimony on this point is as

* Ep. 146: "Ego Domini corpus ita in cœlo esse credo, ut erat in terra, quando ascendit in cœlum." Comp. similar passages in Tract. in Joh. 13; Ep. 187; Serm. 264.

† "Spiritualis alimonia." This expression, however, as the connection of the passage in Serm. lix. 2 clearly shows, by no means excludes an operation of the sacrament on the body; for "spiritual" is often equivalent to "supernatural." Even Ignatius called the bread of the Supper "a medicine of immortality, and an antidote of death" (*φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ διὰ παντός*), Ad Ephes. c. 20; though this passage is wanting in the shorter Syriac recension.

‡ Comp. the relevant passages from the writings of Leo in Perthel, Papst. Leo's I. Leben u. Lehren, p. 216 sqq., and in Rückert, l. c. p. 479 sqq. Leo's doctrine of the Supper is not so clearly defined as his doctrine of Baptism, and has little that is peculiar. But he certainly had a higher than a purely symbolic view of the sacrament and of the sacrifice of the Eucharist.

important as that of the church fathers, presuppose the actual presence of Christ in the Supper, but speak throughout in the stately language of sentiment, and nowhere attempt an explanation of the nature and mode of this presence, and of its relation to the still visible forms of bread and wine. They use concerning the consecrated elements such terms as: the holy body, the dear blood, of our Lord Jesus Christ, the sanctified oblation, the heavenly, spotless, glorious, awful, divine gifts, the awful, unbloody, holy sacrifice, &c. In the act of consecration the liturgies pray for the sending down of the Holy Ghost, that he may "sanctify and perfect"* the bread and wine, or that he may "sanctify and make" them the body and blood of Christ,† or "bless and make."‡

IV. As to the adoration of the consecrated elements: This follows with logical necessity from the doctrine of transubstantiation, and is the sure touchstone of it. No trace of such adoration appears, however, in the ancient liturgies, and the whole patristic literature yields only four passages from which this practice can be inferred; plainly showing that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not yet fixed in the consciousness of the church.

Chrysostom says: "The wise men adored Christ in the manger; we see him not in the manger, but on the altar, and should pay him still greater homage."§ Theodoret, in the passage already cited, likewise uses the term προσκυνεῖν, but at the same time expressly asserts the continuance of the substance of the elements. Ambrose speaks once of the flesh of Christ "which we to-day adore in the mysteries,"‖ and Augustine,

* In the liturgy of St. Mark (in Neale's Ed.: The Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, S. Clement, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, Lond. 1859, p. 26): Ἵνα αὐτὰ ἁγιάσῃ καὶ τελειώσῃ . . . . καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα, to which the congregation answers: Ἀμήν.

† In the liturgy of St. James (in Neale, p. 64): Ἵνα . . . ἁγιάσῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἅγιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, κ. τ. λ.

‡ The liturgy of St. Chrysostom (Neale, p. 137) uses the terms εὐλόγησον and ποίησον.

§ Hom. 24, in 1 Cor.

‖ De Spir. S. iii. 11: "Quam [carnem Christi] hodie in mysteriis adoramus, et quam apostoli in Domino Jesu adoraverunt."

of an adoration preceding the participation of the flesh of Christ.*

In all these passages we must, no doubt, take the term προσκυνεῖν and *adorare* in the wider sense, and distinguish the bowing of the knee, which was so frequent, especially in the East, as a mere mark of respect, from proper adoration. The old liturgies contain no direction for any such act of adoration as became prevalent in the Latin church, with the elevation of the host, after the triumph of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the twelfth century.†

II. *The Eucharist as a Sacrifice.*

The catholic church, both Greek and Latin, sees in the Eucharist not only a *sacramentum*, in which God communicates a grace to believers, but at the same time, and in fact mainly, a *sacrificium*, in which believers really offer to God that which is represented by the sensible elements. For this view also the church fathers laid the foundation, and it must be conceded they stand in general far more on the Greek and Roman Catholic than on the Protestant side of this question. The importance of the subject demands a preliminary explanation of the idea of sacrifice, and a clear discrimination of its original Christian form from its later perversion by tradition.

The idea of sacrifice is the centre of all ancient religions, both the heathen and the Jewish. In Christianity it is fulfilled. For by his one perfect sacrifice on the cross, Christ has

* In Psalm. 98, n. 9: "Ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit; nemo autem illam carnem manducat *nisi prius adoraverit* . . . . . et non modo non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando."

† So says also the Roman liturgist Muratori, De rebus liturgicis, c. xix. p. 227: "Uti omnes inter Catholicos eruditi fatentur, post *Berengarii hæresiam* ritus in Catholica Romana ecclesia invaluit, scilicet post consecrationem elevare hostiam et calicem, ut a populo adoretur corpus et sanguis Domini." Freeman, Principles of Div. Service, Introduction to Part ii. p. 169, asserts: "The church throughout the world, down to the period of the unhappy change of doctrine in the Western church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, never worshipped either the consecrated elements on account of their being the body and blood of Christ, or the presence of that body and blood; nor again, either Christ himself as supernaturally present by consecration, or the presence of his divinity; neither have the churches of God to this hour, with the exception of those of the Roman obedience, any such custom."

entirely blotted out the guilt of man, and reconciled him with the righteous God. On the ground of this sacrifice of the eternal High Priest, believers have access to the throne of grace, and may expect their prayers and intercessions to be heard. With this perfect and eternally availing sacrifice the Eucharist stands in indissoluble connection. It is indeed originally a sacrament, and the main thing in it is that which we *receive* from God, not that which we *give* to God. The latter is only a consequence of the former; for we can give to God nothing which we have not first received from him. But the Eucharist is the *sacramentum* of a *sacrificium*, the thankful celebration of the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross, and the believing participation or the renewed appropriation of the fruits of this sacrifice. In other words, it is a feast on a sacrifice. "As oft as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

The Eucharist is moreover, as the name itself implies, on the part of the church a living and reasonable thank-offering, wherein she presents herself anew, in Christ, and on the ground of his sacrifice, to God, with prayers and intercessions. For only in Christ are our offerings acceptable to God, and only through the continual showing forth and presenting of his merit can we expect our prayers and intercessions to be heard.

In this view certainly, in a deep symbolical and ethical sense, Christ is offered to God the Father in every believing prayer, and above all in the holy Supper; *i. e.*, as the sole ground of our reconciliation and acceptance. This is the deep truth which lies at the bottom of the Catholic mass, and gives it still such power over the religious mind.

But this idea in process of time became adulterated with foreign elements, and transformed into the Græco-Roman doctrine of the *sacrifice of the mass*. According to this doctrine the Eucharist is an unbloody *repetition of the atoning sacrifice of Christ by the priesthood* for the salvation of the living and *the dead;* so that the body of Christ is truly and literally offered every day, and every hour, and upon innumerable altars at the same time. The term *mass*, which properly denoted the *dismissal* of the congregation (*missio*, *dismissio*) at the close of the general public worship, became, after the end

of the fourth century, the name for the worship of the faithful,* which consisted in the celebration of the eucharistic sacrifice and the communion. The corresponding terms of the Orientals are *λειτουργία*, *θυσία*, *προσφορά*.

In the sacrifice of the mass the whole mysterious fulness and glory of the Catholic worship is concentrated. Here the idea of the priesthood reaches its dizzy summit; and here the devotion and awe of the spectators rises to the highest pitch of adoration. For to the devout Catholic there can be nothing greater or more solemn than an act of worship, in which the eternal Son of God is veritably offered to God upon the altar by the visible hand of the priest for the sins of the world. But, though the Catholic worship here rises far above the vain sacrifices of heathendom and the merely typical sacrifices of Judaism, yet that old sacrificial service, which was interwoven with the whole popular life of the Jewish and Græco-Roman world, exerted a controling influence on the Roman Catholic service of the Eucharist, especially after the nominal conversion of the whole Roman heathendom, and obscured the original simplicity and purity of that service almost beyond recognition. The *sacramentum* became entirely eclipsed by the *sacrificium*, and the sacrificium became grossly materialized, and was exalted at the expense of the sacrifice on the cross. The endless succession of necessary repetitions detracts from the sacrifice of Christ.

The biblical support of the sacrifice of the mass is weak, and may be reduced to an unduly literal interpretation, or a downright perversion, of some such passages as Mal. i. 10 f.; 1 Cor. x. 21; Heb. v. 6; vii. 1 ff.; xiii. 10. The Epistle to the Hebrews especially is often misapplied, though it teaches with great emphasis the very opposite, viz., the abolition of the Old Testament sacrificial system by the Christian worship, the eternal validity of the sacrifice of our only High Priest on the right hand of the Father, and the impossibility of a repetition of it (comp. x. 14; vii. 23, 24).

We pass now to the more particular history. The ante-

* The *missa fidelium*, in distinction from the *missa catechumenorum*. Comp. Schaff, vol. i. § 101, p. 383 sqq.

Nicene fathers uniformly conceived the Eucharist as a thank-offering of the church; the congregation offering the consecrated elements of bread and wine, and in them itself, to God. This view is in itself perfectly innocent, but readily leads to the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, as soon as the elements become identified with the body and blood of Christ, and the presence of the body comes to be materialistically taken. The germs of the Roman doctrine appear in Cyprian about the middle of the third century, in connection with his high churchly doctrine of the clerical priesthood. *Sacerdotium* and *sacrificium* are with him correlative ideas, and a Judaizing conception of the former favoured a like Judaizing conception of the latter. The priest officiates in the Eucharist in the place of Christ,* and performs an actual sacrifice in the church.† Yet Cyprian does not distinctly say that Christ is the subject of the spiritual sacrifice; rather is the mystical body of Christ, the church, offered to God, and married with Christ.‡

The doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is much further developed in the Nicene and post-Nicene fathers, though amidst many obscurities and rhetorical extravagances, and with much wavering between symbolical and grossly realistic conceptions, until in all essential points it is brought to its settlement by Gregory the Great at the close of the sixth century. These points are the following:

1. The eucharistic sacrifice is the most solemn mystery of the church, and fills the faithful with a holy awe. Hence the predicates, *θυσία φοβερά*, *φρικτή*, *ἀναίμακτος*, *sacrificium tremendum*, which are frequently applied to it, especially in the Oriental liturgies and homilies. Thus it is said in the liturgy of St. James: "We offer to Thee, O Lord, this awful and unbloody sacrifice." The more surprising is it that the people should have been indifferent to so solemn an act, and that

* "Vice Christi vere fungitur."

† "Sacrificium verum et plenum offert in ecclesia Patri."

‡ Epist. 63 ad Cæcil. c. 14. Augustine's view is similar: the church offering herself to God, in and with Christ as her head.

Chrysostom should lament: "In vain is the daily sacrifice, in vain stand we at the altar: there is no one to take part."*

2. It is not a new sacrifice added to that of the cross, but a daily, unbloody repetition, and perpetual application of that one only sacrifice. Augustine represents it, on the one hand, as a *sacramentum memoriæ*, a symbolical commemoration of the sacrificial death of Christ;—to which of course there is no objection.† But, on the other hand, he calls the celebration of the communion *verissimum sacrificium* of the body of Christ. The church, he says, offers (*immolat*) to God the sacrifice of thanks in the body of Christ, from the days of the apostles through the sure succession of the bishops down to our time. But the church at the same time offers, with Christ, herself, as the body of Christ, to God. As all are one body, so also all are together the same sacrifice.‡ According to Chrysostom, the same Christ, and the whole Christ, is everywhere offered. It is not a different sacrifice from that which the High Priest formerly offered, but we offer always the same sacrifice, or rather, we perform a memorial of this sacrifice.§ This last clause would decidedly favour a symbolical conception, if Chrysostom in other places had not used such strong expressions as this: "When thou seest the Lord slain, and lying there, and

* Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Ephes. (new Par. Bened. ed. tom. xi., p. 26): Εἰκῇ θυσία καθημερινή, εἰκῇ παρεστήκαμεν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐδεὶς ὁ μετέχων, *i. e.*, Frustra est quotidianum sacrificium, frustra adstamus altari: nemo est qui participet.

† Contr. Faust. Manich. l. xx. 18: "Unde jam Christiani, *peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam* celebrant, sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi." Comp. l. xx. 21. This agrees with Augustine's symbolical conception of the consecrated elements as signa, imagines, similitudines corporis et sanguinis Christi. Steitz, l. c. p. 379, would make him altogether a symbolist, but does not succeed; comp. the preceding section, and Neander, Dogmengesch. i. p. 432.

‡ De civit. Dei, x. 20: "Per hoc [homo Jesus Christus] et sacerdos est ipse offerens, ipse et oblatio. Cujus rei sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit ecclesiæ sacrificium, quæ cum ipsius capitis corpus sit, se ipsam per ipsum offere discit." And the faithful in heaven form with us one sacrifice, since they with us are one civitas Dei.

§ Hom. xvii. in Ep. ad Hebr. tom. xii., p. 241 and 242:—Τοῦτο γὰρ ποιεῖτε, φησὶν, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

the priest standing at the sacrifice," or: "Christ lies slain upon the altar."*

3. The sacrifice is the antitype of the Mosaic sacrifice, and is related to it as substance to typical shadows. It is also especially foreshadowed by Melchizedek's unbloody offering of bread and wine. The sacrifice of Melchizedek is therefore made of great account by Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and other church fathers, on the strength of the well-known parallel in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

4. The subject of the sacrifice is the body of Jesus Christ, which is as truly present on the altar of the church as it once was on the altar of the cross, and which now offers itself to God through his priest. Hence the frequent language of the liturgies: "Thou art he who offerest, and who art offered, O Christ, our God." Augustine, however, connects with this, as we have already said, the true and important moral idea of the self-sacrifice of the whole redeemed church to God. The prayers of the liturgies do the same.†

5. The offering of the sacrifice is the exclusive prerogative of the Christian priest. Later Roman divines take the words: "This *do* (*ποιεῖτε*) in remembrance of me," as equivalent to: "This *offer*," and limit this command to the apostles and their successors in office, whereas it is evidently an exhortation to all believers to the commemoration of the atoning death, the *communio sacramenti*, and not to the *immolatio sacrificii*.

6. The sacrifice is efficacious for the whole body of the

* De sacerd. iii., c. 4 (tom. i., 467): Ὅταν ἴδῃς τὸν Κύριον τεθυμένον καὶ κείμενον, καὶ τὸν ἱερέα ἐφεστῶτα τῷ θύματι, καὶ ἐπευχόμενον, κ. τ. λ. Homil. xv. ad Popul. Antioch. c. 5 (tom. ii. p. 187): Ἔνθα ὁ Χριστος κεῖται τεθυμένος. Comp. Hom. in tom. ii., p. 394, where it is said of the sacrifice of the Eucharist: Θυσία προσέρχῃ φρικτῇ καὶ ἁγιᾷ· ἐσφαγμένος πρόκειται ὁ Χριστὸς.

† Freeman regards this as the main thing in the old liturgies. "In all liturgies," says he, l. c. p. 190, "the church has manifestly two distinct though closely connected objects in view. The first is, *to offer herself in Christ to God;* or rather, in strictness and as the highest conception of her aim, to *procure that she may be offered by Christ himself, and as in Christ, to the Father.* And the second object, as the crowning and completing feature of the rite, and woven up with the other in one unbroken chain of service, is *to obtain communion through Christ with God;* or more precisely again, that *Christ may himself give her, through himself, such communion.*"

church, including its departed members, in procuring the gifts which are implored in the prayers of the service. All the old liturgies proceed under a conviction of the unbroken communion of saints, and contain commemorations and intercessions for the departed fathers and brethren, who are conceived to be, not in purgatory, but in communion with God, and in a condition of progressive holiness and blessedness, looking forward in pious longing to the great day of consummation. These prayers for an increase of bliss, which appeared afterwards very inappropriate, form the transition from the original simple commemoration of the departed saints, including the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, to intercessions for the suffering souls in purgatory, as now used in the Roman church since the sixth century.*

In the Liturgy of Chrysostom, still in use in the Greek and Russian church, the commemoration of the departed reads: "And further we offer to Thee this reasonable service on behalf of those who have departed in the faith, our ancestors, Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Preachers, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith. . . . . Especially the most holy, undefiled, excellently laudable, glorious lady, the mother of God and ever Virgin Mary. . . . . The holy John the Prophet, Forerunner and Baptist, the holy, glorious, and all celebrated Apostles, and all Thy Saints, through whose prayers look upon us, O God. And remember all those that are departed in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life, and give them rest where the light of Thy countenance shines upon them."

Cyril of Jerusalem, in his fifth and last mystagogic Catechesis, which is devoted to the consideration of the eucharistic sacrifice and the liturgical service of God, gives the following description of the eucharistic intercessions for the departed:

* Neale has collected in an appendix to his English edition of the old liturgies (The Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, etc. Lond. 1859, p. 216 sqq.) the finest liturgical prayers of the ancient church for the departed saints, and deduces from them the positions, (1) "that prayers for the dead, and more especially the oblation of the blessed Eucharist for them, have been from the beginning the practice of the universal church. (2) And this without any idea of a purgatory of pain, or of any state from which the departed soul has to be delivered as from one of misery." The second point needs qualification.

"When the spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody service of God, is performed, we pray to God over this atoning sacrifice for the universal peace of the church, for the welfare of the world, for the emperor, for soldiers and prisoners, for the sick and afflicted, for all the poor and needy. Then we commemorate also those who sleep, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God through their prayers and their intercessions may receive our prayer; and in general we pray for all who have gone from us, since we believe that it is of the greatest help to those souls for whom the prayer is offered, while the holy sacrifice, exciting a holy awe, lies before us.*

This is clearly an approach to the later idea of purgatory in the Latin church. Even St. Augustine, with Tertullian, teaches plainly, as an old tradition, that the eucharistic sacrifice, the intercessions or *suffragia* and alms of the living, are of benefit to the departed believers, so that the Lord deals more mercifully with them than their sins deserve.† His noble mother, Monica, when dying, told him he might bury her body where he pleased, and should give himself no concern for it, only she begged of him that he would remember her soul at the altar of the Lord.‡

With this is connected the idea of a repentance and purification in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection, which likewise Augustine derives from Matt. xii. 32, and 1 Cor. iii. 15, yet mainly as a mere opinion.§ From these and similar passages, and under the influence of previous

* Τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φριχωδεστάτης προκειμένης θυσίας, Catech. xxiii. 8.

† Serm. 172, 2 (Opp. tom. v. 1196): "Orationibus sanctæ ecclesiæ, et sacrificio salutari, et eleemosynis, quæ pro eorum spiritibus erogantur, non est dubitandum mortuos adjuvari, ut cum eis misericordius agatur a Domino." He expressly limits this effect, however, to those who have departed *in the faith*.

‡ Confess. l. ix. 27: "Tantum illud vos rogo, ut ad Domini altare memineritis mei, ubi fueritis." Tertullian considers it the duty of a devout widow to pray for the soul of her husband, and to offer a sacrifice on the anniversary of his death; De monogam. c. 10; comp. De corona, c. 2: "Oblationes pro defunctis pro natalitiis annua die facimus."

§ De civit. Dei, xxi. 24, and elsewhere. The passages of Augustine and the other fathers in favour of the doctrine of purgatory are collected in the much cited work of Berington and Kirk: The Faith of Catholics, etc., vol. iii. p. 140—207.

Jewish and heathen ideas and customs, arose, after Gregory the Great, the Roman doctrine of the purgatorial fire for imperfect believers who still need to be purified from the dross of their sins before they are fit for heaven, and the institution of special *masses for the dead*, in which the perversion of the thankful remembrance of the one eternally availing sacrifice of Christ reaches its height, and the idea of the communion utterly disappears. There are silent masses, *missæ solitariæ*, at which usually no one is present but the priest, with the attendant boys, who offers to God at a certain tariff the magically produced body of Christ for the deliverance of a soul from purgatory. This institution has also a heathen precedent in the old Roman custom of offering sacrifices to the Manes of beloved dead. On Gregory's doctrine of the mass, comp. the monograph of Lau, p. 484 sq. The horrible abuse of these masses for the dead, and their close connection with superstitious impostures of purgatory and of indulgence, explain the moral anger of the Reformers at the mass, and the strong declarations against it in several symbolical books, especially in the Smalcald articles of Luther and in the 80th question of the Heidelberg Catechism.

In general, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the sacrament continually retired behind the sacrifice. In the Roman churches in all countries one may see and hear splendid masses at the high altar, where the congregation of the faithful, instead of taking part in the communion, are mere spectators of the sacrificial act of the priest. The communion is frequently despatched at a side altar at an early hour in the morning.

III. *The Celebration of the Eucharist.*

The celebration of the eucharistic sacrifice and of the communion was the centre and summit of the public worship of the Lord's day, and all other parts of worship served as preparation and accompaniment. The old liturgies are essentially, and almost exclusively, eucharistic prayers and exercises; they contain nothing besides, except some baptismal formulas and prayers for the catechumens. The word liturgy (*λειτουργία*), which properly embraces all parts of the worship of God,

denotes in the narrower sense a celebration of the Eucharist or the mass.

Here lies a cardinal difference between the Catholic and Evangelical cultus: in the former the sacrifice of the mass, in the latter the sermon is the centre.

With all variations in particulars, especially in the introductory portions, the old Catholic liturgies agree in the essential points, particularly in the prayers which immediately precede and follow the consecration of the elements. They all (excepting some Syriac copies of certain Nestorian and Monophysite formularies) repeat the solemn Words of Institution from the Gospels, understanding them not merely in a declaratory, but in an operative sense; they all contain the acts of Consecration, Intercession, and Communion; all (except the Roman) invoke the Holy Ghost upon the elements to sanctify them, and make them actual vehicles of the body and blood of Christ; all conceive the Eucharist primarily as a sacrifice, and then, on the basis of the sacrifice, as a communion.

The eucharistic action in the narrower sense is called the *Anaphora*, or the *canon missæ*, and begins after the close of the service of the catechumens (which consisted principally of reading and preaching, and extended to the Offertory, *i. e.*, the preparation of the bread and wine, and the placing of it on the altar). It is introduced with the Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας, or *Sursum corda*, of the priest: the exhortation to the faithful to lift up their hearts in devotion, and take part in the prayers; to which the congregation answers: *Habemus ad Dominum*, "*We lift them up unto the Lord.*" Then follows the exhortation: "Let us give thanks to the Lord," with the response: "*It is meet and right.*"*

* Or, according to the Liturgia S. Jacobi: Ἄνω σχῶμεν τὸν νοῦν καὶ τὰς καρδίας, with the response: Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον. In the Lit. S. Clem.: *Priest:* Ἄνω τὸν νοῦν. *Alii* (πάντες): Ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.—Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ. Resp.: Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον. In the Lit. S. Chrys. (still in use in the orthodox Greek and Russian Church):

Ὁ ἱερεύς· Ἄνω σχῶμεν τὰς καρδίας.

Ὁ χορός· Ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.

Ὁ ἱερεύς· Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ.

Ὁ χορός· Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον ἐστὶ προσκυνεῖν Πατέρα, Υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, Τριάδα ὁμοούσιον καὶ ἀχώριστον.

The first principal act of the Anaphora is the great *prayer of thanksgiving*, the εὐλογία or εὐχαριστία, after the example of the Saviour in the institution of the Supper. In this prayer the priest thanks God for all the gifts of creation and of redemption, and the choir generally concludes the thanksgiving with the so-called Trisagion or Seraphic Hymn (Isa. vi. 3), and the triumphal Hosanna (Matt. xxi. 9): "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Hosanna in the highest: blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest."

Then follows the *consecration* and *oblation* of the elements, by the commemoration of the great facts in the life of Christ, by the rehearsing of the Words of Institution from the Gospels or from Paul, and by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, who brings to pass the mysterious change of the bread and wine into the sacramental body and blood of Christ.* This invocation of the Holy Ghost† appears in all the Oriental liturgies, but is wanting in the Latin church, which ascribes the consecration exclusively to the virtue of Christ's Words of Institution. The form of the Words of Institution is different in the different liturgies.‡ The elevation of the consecrated elements was introduced in the Latin church, though not till after the Berengarian controversies in the eleventh century, to give the people occasion to show, by the adoration of the host, their faith in the real presence of Christ in the sacrament.

To add an example: The prayer of consecration and oblation in one of the oldest and most important of the liturgies, that of St. James, runs thus. After the Words of Institution, the priest proceeds:

"*Priest:* We sinners, remembering his life-giving passion, his saving cross, his death and his resurrection from the dead

* Hence it is said, for example, in the Syriac version of the Liturgy of St. James: "How dreadful is this hour, in which the Holy Ghost hastens to come down from the heights of heaven, and broods over the Eucharist, and sanctifies it. In holy silence and fear stand and pray."

† Ἐπίκλησις Πνεύματος ἁγίου, invocatio Spiritus Sancti.

‡ They are collected by Neale, in his English edition of the Primitive Liturgies, p. 175—215, from 67 ancient liturgies in alphabetical order. Freeman says, rather too strongly, l. c. p. 364: "No two churches in the world have even the same words of Institution."

on the third day, his ascension to heaven, and his sitting at the right-hand of Thee his God and Father, and his glorious and terrible second appearing, when he shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works,—offer to Thee, O Lord, this awful and unbloody sacrifice;* beseeching Thee that Thou wouldst deal with us not after our sins nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to Thy goodness and unspeakable love to men wouldst blot out the handwriting which is against us Thy suppliants, and wouldst vouchsafe to us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man what Thou, O God, hast prepared for them that love Thee. And reject not Thy people, O loving Lord, for my sake and on account of my sins.

He repeats thrice: For Thy people and Thy church prayeth to Thee.

People: Have mercy upon us, O Lord God, Almighty Father!

Priest: Have mercy upon us, Almighty God!

Have mercy upon us, O God, our Redeemer!

Have mercy upon us, O God, according to Thy great mercy, and send upon us, and upon these gifts here present, Thy most holy Spirit, Lord, Giver of life, who with Thee the God and Father, and with Thine only begotten Son, sitteth and reigneth upon one throne, and is of the same essence and co-eternal,† who spoke in the law and in the prophets, and in Thy new covenant, who descended in the form of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, and rested upon him, who came down upon Thy holy apostles in the form of tongues of fire in the upper room of Thy holy and glorious Zion on the day of Pentecost: Send down, O Lord, the same Holy Ghost upon us and upon these holy gifts here present, that with his holy and good and glorious

* Προσφέρομέν σοι, Δέσποτα, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν. The term φοβερά denotes *holy* awe, and is previously applied also to the second coming of Christ: Τῆς δευτέρας ἐνδόξου καὶ φοβερᾶς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, κ. τ. λ., μεμνημένοι. The Liturgy of St. Chrysostom has instead: Προσφέρομέν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν (doubtless with reference to the λογικὴ λατρεία in Rom. xii. 1).

† Ἐξαπόστειλον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ παναγιον, [εἶτα κλίνας τὸν αὐχένα λέγει·] τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ σύνθρονον σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ μονογενεῖ σου Υἱῷ, τὸ συμβασιλεῦον, τῷ ὁμοούσιον τε καὶ συναίδιον. The ὁμοούσιον as well as the Nicene Creed in the preceding part of the Liturgy of St. James, indicates a post-Nicene origin.

presence He may sanctify this bread and make it the holy body of Thy Christ.*

People: Amen.

Priest: And this cup the dear blood of Thy Christ.

People: Amen.

Priest: (In a low voice): That they may avail to those who receive them, for the forgiveness of sins and for eternal life, for the sanctification of soul and body, for the bringing forth of good works, for the strengthening of Thy holy Catholic Church which Thou hast built upon the rock of faith, that the gates of hell may not prevail against her; delivering her from all error, and all scandal, and from the ungodly, and preserving her unto the consummation of all things."

After the act of consecration come the *intercessions*, sometimes very long, for the church, for all classes, for the living, and for the dead from righteous Abel to Mary, the apostles, the martyrs, and the saints in Paradise; and finally the Lord's Prayer. To the several intercesssions, and the Lord's Prayer, the people or the choir responds, *Amen*. With this closes the act of eucharistic sacrifice.

Now follows the *communion*, or the participation of the consecrated elements. It is introduced with the words: "Holy things for holy persons,"† and the *Kyrie eleison*, or (as in the Clementine liturgy) the *Gloria in Excelsis:* "Glory be to God on high, peace on earth, and good will to men.‡ Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: God is the Lord, and he hath appeared among us." The bishop and the clergy communicate first, and then the people. The formula of distribution in the Clementine liturgy is simply: "The body of Christ;" "The blood of Christ, the cup of life,"§ to which the receiver answers "*Amen*." In other liturgies it is longer.‖

* Ἵνα . . . . ἁγιάσῃ καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἅγιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.

† Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, Sancta Sanctis. It is a warning to the unworthy not to approach the table of the Lord.

‡ According to the usual reading ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. But the older and better attested reading is εὐδοκίας, which alters the sense and makes the angelic hymn bimembris: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of his good pleasure" (*i. e.*, the chosen people of God).

§ Σῶμα Χριστοῦ—Αἷμα Χριστου, ποτήριον ζωῆς.

‖ In the Liturgy of St. Mark: Σῶμα ἁγιου—Αἷμα τίμιον τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ

The holy act closes with prayers of thanksgiving, psalms, and the benediction.

The Eucharist was celebrated daily, or at least every Sunday. The people were exhorted to frequent communion, especially on the high festivals. In North Africa some communed every day, others every Sunday, others still less frequently.* Augustine leaves this to the needs of every believer, but says in one place: "The Eucharist is our daily bread." The daily communion was connected with the current mystical interpretation of the fourth petition in the Lord's Prayer. Basil communed four times in the week. Gennadius of Massilia commands at least weekly communion. In the East it seems to have been the custom, after the fourth century, to commune only once a year, or on great occasions. Chrysostom often complains of the indifference of those who come to church only to hear the sermon, or who attend the eucharistic sacrifice, but do not commune. One of his allusions to this neglect we have already quoted. Some later councils threatened all laymen with excommunication, who did not commune at least on Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.

In the Oriental and North African churches prevailed the incongruous custom of *infant* communion, which seemed to follow from infant baptism, and was advocated by Augustine and Innocent I., on the authority of John vi. 53. In the Greek church this custom continues to this day, but in the Latin, after the ninth century, it was disputed or forbidden, because the apostle (1 Cor. xi. 28, 29) requires self-examination as the condition of worthy participation.†

With this custom appear the first instances, and they ex-

Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. In the Mozarabic Liturgy the communicating priest prays: "Corpus et sanguis Domini noster Jesu Christi custodiat corpus et animam meam in vitam æternam." Resp. "*Amen.*" So in the Roman Liturgy, from which it passed into the Anglican.

* Augustine, Epist. 118 ad Januar. c. 2: "Alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini Dominico; alii certis diebus accipiunt; alibi nullus dies intermittitur quo non offeratur; alii sabbato tantum et Dominico; alibi tantum Dominico."

† Comp. P. Zorn: Historia eucharistiæ infantium. Berol. 1736; and the article by Kling in Herzog's Encykl. vii. 549 sqq.

ceptional, of a communio sub *una* specie; after a little girl in Carthage in the time of Cyprian had been made drunk by receiving the wine. But the withholding of the cup from the laity, which transgresses the express command of the Lord, "Drink ye *all* of it," and is associated with a superstitious horror of profaning the blood of the Lord by spilling, and with the development of the power of the priesthood, dates only from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and was then justified by the scholastic doctrine of concomitance.

In the Greek church it was customary to dip the bread in the wine, and deliver both elements in a spoon.

The customs of house-communion and after-communion for the sick and for prisoners, of distributing the unconsecrated remainder of the bread among the non-communicants, and of sending the consecrated elements, or their substitutes,* to distant bishops or churches at Easter as a token of fellowship, are very old.

The Greek church used leaven bread, the Latin, unleavened. This difference ultimately led to intricate controversies.

The mixing of the wine with water was considered essential, and was explained in various mystical ways; chiefly by reference to the blood and water which flowed from the side of Jesus on the cross.

* These substitutes for the consecrated elements were called *αντίδωρα* (*i. e.*, *ἀντὶ τῶν δώρων εὐχαριστικῶν*), and *eulogiæ* (from the benediction at the close of the service).

ART. IV.—*The Life of Horace Mann.* By his Wife. Boston: Walker, Fuller & Co. 1865.

THE opinions of a public functionary are a legitimate subject of review, so far as they affect the interests of the community. The late HORACE MANN was, for about twelve years, actively engaged in behalf of the public schools of Massachusetts, and afterwards, for several years, he was President of Antioch College, at Yellow Springs, Ohio, and his fame and influence have extended to the borders of our land. The volume before us was written by his widow, and is a faithful and loving tribute of a warm-hearted woman, to the personal worth and life-long labours of her husband. Our purpose is to delineate the form and pressure of his peculiar views and measures *as an educator of the young.*

Mr. Mann was born in Franklin, Massachusetts, May 4, 1796. He was thirteen when he lost his father, and he lived with his mother till he was twenty. "All the family laboured together for the common support, and toil was considered honourable, although it was sometimes, of necessity, excessive." It shows the narrowness of their means, that the boy earned the money to buy his school books by braiding straw. By diligent application he was prepared to enter the Sophomore class of Brown University in 1816—graduated with honourable distinction—served his *alma mater* for a time, successfully, as tutor of Latin and Greek, was admitted to the bar at the close of 1823—elected to the State Legislature in 1827, and Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education in 1837—became a member of Congress in 1847, and President of Antioch College in 1853, which office he held at his death in 1859. This is the briefest outline of an uncommonly active, earnest, and, in many respects, useful life. Our filling up must necessarily be very scant.

Mr. Mann's childhood is represented as having been unhappy. "He retained only painful recollections" of it. "The poverty of my parents," he says, "subjected me to continued privations." "My teachers were very good people, but they

were very poor teachers." "Our eyes were never trained to distinguish forms and colours. Our ears were strangers to music." But "more than by toil or by the privation of any natural taste, was the inward joy of my youth blighted by theological inculcations."

What first led him to doubt the religious views in which he had been educated does not appear, though he is very explicit in condemning them as utterly unscriptural and injurious in their influence; and in assuming the office of Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, he doubtless promised himself the enviable privilege of rescuing the minds and hearts of a generation of children and youth from the thraldom of bigotry and fanaticism. He conceived that a system of religious doctrines had been palmed upon the community that were at variance with all proper notions of the character and requirements of the Supreme Being. These false and mischievous opinions were too deeply imbedded in the adult mind of the country to be corrected or materially modified, but the throng of school children were still within reach. Their docile minds might be imbued with more rational and enlightened views, and with happier religious emotions. And as his own childhood and youth had been made inexpressibly gloomy and wretched by sundry dogmas, with which he tells us he was "familiar at ten years of age," his sympathies were naturally kindled in behalf of others who are victims of the same calamity.

Whether the doctrines which Mr. Mann specifies as having filled him with such horror were ever taught or held by any considerable body of people in their senses, it is not to our purpose to inquire. It is evident that in some way or other, (perhaps from a verse of one of good Dr. Watts's hymns, which we are told "cannot now be found,") he had been led to embrace a faith which "spread a pall of blackness over the whole heavens, shutting out every beautiful and glorious thing; while beyond that curtain of darkness, he could see the bottomless and seething lake, filled with torments, and hear the wailings of its victims." "Images of terror haunted his mind day and night."

A friend to whom he unbosomed himself, describes him as "well nigh to insanity." His darling brother, at twelve years

of age was drowned, and "his agonized heart stimulated his imagination to clothe a 'solitary soul' in hell with his brother's form and feature." "His whole being rose up against the idea of such a cruel Creator, and declared *hatred* to him." The effect of thus putting himself "at odds," with what he still thought infinite power, was fearful. "His imagination was possessed with the idea of a personal devil;" and "nature seemed to him but the specious veil in which demons clothed themselves. * * He expected the foul fiend to appear from behind every hedge and tree to carry him off." So intense was this nervous excitement by night, that "he saw fiends and other horrid shapes distinctly as with his bodily eyes, and was obliged to use the utmost force of his will to keep from screaming;" and not until twelve years of age was he relieved. His friend regards it as a marvel that "so sensitive a boy, absolutely banished from the bosom of a Heavenly Father, grew up so sweet, so truthful, so faithful to the unknown God whom he ignorantly worshipped, and who, unawares to himself, strengthened him for his protest against the popular theology." It does not seem to have been by any process through which common people can expect to pass, that he obtained relief, but as his friend tells us, "it was the exercise of his great intellectual faculties and of his pure and noble affections in philanthropy," that "gradually brought him into a healthier atmosphere of feeling and thought, and, at last, his happy marriage seemed to justify God's creation."

The release from the bondage of his religious education was not gradual however. He remembered the day, the hour, the place, the circumstances, when "in an agony of despair he broke the spell that bound him," but he does not record any of them. From what source the light came which now dawned upon him, is also a mystery, but by it he was enabled at once to "construct a theory of Christian ethics and doctrine respecting virtue and vice, rewards and penalties, time and eternity, God and his providence, out of which his life flowed," to which he steadfastly adhered, and which, as we shall see, constituted the basis of his theories and schemes of popular education. After the death of his wife (an event which nearly "deprived him of life and reason"), we are told that "happier

religious associations aided his own efforts to put himself in harmony with the universe, whose adaptations to the soul of man had again been lost sight of by his crushing sorrow." "Baptized in the divine flame, which sorrow lights in the soul, he was ready," when he returned to the world, "to do all he could to supply its needs."

It would be very difficult to make out from the volume before us, what form of doctrinal belief Mr. Mann substituted for that which he renounced, and yet one would think the chief work of his life (in his own esteem), was such as to make this a primary question. Education has certainly no less to do with the conscience and heart, than with the understanding. Most of our relations to our fellow-men, for which education is to prepare us, grow out of our relations to God. What those relations are and what duties they involve, is an inquiry of absorbing interest to every moral being. Whence shall we obtain this important knowledge? From the Holy Scriptures, would be the answer of most persons in Christian lands, but Mr. Mann would not echo that answer. In his view, "natural religion stands as preëminent over revealed religion as the deepest experience over the lightest hearsay." He held "that the power of natural religion has scarcely begun to be understood and appreciated," and he believed "the time is coming when the light of natural religion will be to that of revealed as the rising sun is to the day-star that preceded it." With this low estimate of the light by which the bulk of the people of Christendom must be content to walk, it is not so much a matter of surprise, perhaps, that he embraced with eagerness a system of "philosophical and moral doctrines," the prevalence of which would, in his view, "produce a new earth at least, if not a new heaven." This revelation he found in Combe's "*Constitution of Man*," a volume which he did not meet with till he was past forty, but just as he entered on his work as an educator he fell in with it, and ever after made it his text-book.

Before we attempt a sketch of Mr. Mann's labours, we must, in justice to him, present a little more in detail his conception of the work assigned him. He had conceived the idea, as we have seen, that the human mind is, to a large extent, in abject bondage to bigotry. He looked upon what is called the "evangelical faith"—that is the faith in the Gospels as inspired

of God, which seven-eighths of Protestant Christians embrace—with the greatest aversion. His strong feeling on this point is conspicuous throughout the volume. In a letter to his sister, written at the mature age of forty, in reply to one in which she had referred to some doctrinal opinions, the influence of which (as he thought), would be to render her unhappy, he says: "It is this knowledge of the inevitable effect of such a faith upon a nature like yours, that gives me pain. I claim no superior sensibility to the fate of others, over the mass of my fellow-men; but I know that, to my nature, there can be no compensation in the highest happiness and that of the longest duration, for the endless and remediless misery of a single *sentient* thing. No: though the whole offspring of the Creator, with the exception of one solitary being, were gathered into a heaven of unimaginable blessedness, while that one solitary being, wide apart in some region of immensity, however remote, were wedded to immortal pain, even then, just so soon as the holy principle of love sprung up in the hearts of that happy assembly, just so soon would they forget their joy, and forget their God, and the whole universe of them, as one spirit, gather round and weep over the sufferer." In the same letter he speaks of "months" in which he "daily and hourly yearned for death, as much as ever a famishing infant yearned for the breast of his mother," but "during all that time," he says, "I felt not a moment's remorse because I had not loved God more. I felt, indeed, that it was a great and irreparable misfortune, that I had not been taught the existence of a God worthy of being loved."

It is difficult to persuade ourselves that a mother with whom he lived till he was twenty, and whom he describes as "the purest, strongest, wisest"—who "invariably kept her eye fixed upon his highest welfare," and whose "wise and judicious counsels were sanctified and hallowed" while she was yet alive, should have failed to impress upon his mind just conceptions of the Divine Being; and especially that the eye of her fatherless son should never have been turned, under her influence, towards a merciful and loving Father in heaven.

Again he admonishes his sister that "what we learn from books—even what we think we are taught in the Bible—may

be mistaken or misapprehended, but the lessons we learn from our own consciousness are the very voice of the Being that created us; and about it can there be any mistake?"

He describes the transcendental philosopher, *Ralph Waldo Emerson*, as occupying "a central position in the spiritual world, which enables him to discover harmony and order where others can discern only confusion and irregularity."

These few paragraphs may serve to introduce us into the sphere in which Mr. Mann lived, moved, and had his being. He satisfied himself that a system of faith is widely adopted, that is derogatory to the character of God and dwarfing and enslaving to the mind of man, and he gave himself, with consuming zeal, to vindicate the former and emancipate the latter. Whether this condition of mind made him a fitting instrument for administering a grand educational system in old Massachusetts, we must be permitted to doubt.

The words "orthodox" and "ultra-orthodox," Calvinist and dogmatist, fanatics and bigots, stood for persons and things that were highly obnoxious to him, and to those who had his warmest sympathies; and his whole career as an educator was, in its spirit, (so far as the memoir reveals it), a crusade against the system of faith which had prevailed in New England from its beginning.

Without attempting to define that system fully or accurately, it may suffice to say that its chief points are, (1.) The existence of an eternal, unchangeable, and infinitely holy God, the creator and governor of all worlds; the sovereign disposer of all persons and events, and the only proper object of religious worship. (2.) The divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and their sufficiency and infallibility as a rule of faith. (3.) The sinfulness of man's nature in consequence of the apostacy of our first parents, and the necessity of supernatural power to restore him to the Divine favour. (4.) The grace of God revealed in the person and offices of the Lord Jesus Christ, who was incarnate by the Holy Ghost, and, after a life of unparalleled benevolence and humiliation, offered himself a sacrifice for sin, so that God might be just, and yet justify all who repent and believe his holy gospel. (5.) The law being thus honoured by the perfect obedience and atoning

sacrifice of the Son of God, who was also the Son of man, there is now no condemnation to such as believe on and obey him, while to those who refuse such faith and obedience, the penalty of the Divine law stands in full force and rigour. (6.) This penalty, by whatever term expressed, involves the irretrievable loss of God's favour, and everlasting banishment from his presence, and, of course, from all sources of peace and happiness.

We suppose it will be admitted that these views, in substance, have prevailed in the religious communities of New England from 1620 until now. They were inculcated in children's hymns, catechisms, and primers; they were taught by parents to their children, by teachers to their pupils, by pastors to their people, and by authors to their readers. It was not until a comparatively late period that such doctrines were condemned as "impediments to the progress of our race towards perfection, unworthy of God, and debasing to the minds and hearts of men." So firmly were these and the like doctrines (or dogmas) imbedded in the New England mind, that it required many years and powerful influences to wrench them out, and still more to gain a foothold for opposite or inconsistent views. Any one who reads the religious writings of the wisest, godliest, and most learned men of the first century and a half of New England history, will be abundantly satisfied that what Mr. Mann strove so rudely to thrust aside under the name of bigotry or fanaticism, was the system of faith uniformly received and adopted, through five, if not six or even seven successive generations of that people. A catalogue of the men and women who exemplified the power of this evangelical or orthodox faith in their lives, and who, in the strength of it, triumphed over sin, adversity and death, would embrace the noblest and most venerable names of New England and, indeed, of American genealogy. Nor was it a difficult matter under the old school-laws of that State, to train up a generation of children in the religious views which prevailed in the community around them. Each municipality had its schools under its own control. The choice of the teacher, the books to be used, the course of instruction, and the general influence of the school, were exclusively in the hands of the people of the

several towns. The legal voters in these little sovereignties having the direction of the discipline and instruction of their schools, it came to pass that the religious tone and sentiment of the people generally prevailed in the school, and it was moreover the province and practice of the public teachers of religion to summon the children together, at short intervals, and instruct them in doctrine and duty.

When the State, upon the adjustment of some war claims, received a large sum of money from the Federal Government, it was funded, and its income appropriated to the support of public schools. This measure, of itself, might have been harmless, but it led to the organization of a central power in the form of a Board of Education, and thus brought the whole system and all its machinery into the vortex of conflicting political and religious opinions.

If the successive steps to this new order of things could be laid bare, it would probably be found that most of its active promoters were persuaded that greater efficiency and thoroughness would thereby be secured, and a much higher grade of instruction be attained in the public schools; but there were others who saw in it an opportunity to "liberalize" the whole system of instruction, and make it subserve the views of a theological, psychological, or anthropological school, of which Mr. George Combe was a distinguished teacher, and Mr. Mann a most zealous and faithful disciple.

We will not attempt even a sketch of the peculiarities of this school. A few paragraphs from the chief text-book will sufficiently indicate its leanings.

"Before phrenology was known, the moral and intellectual condition of man was unascertained." Page 205.*

"Before the discovery of phrenology, the mental constitution of man was a matter of vain conjecture and endless debate, and the connection between his mental powers and his organized system was involved in the deepest obscurity." P. 293.

"The character of the Divine Being, under the natural system, will go on rising in exact proportion as his works shall be understood." P. 205.

* "Constitution of Man," Boston edition. 1824.

"Differences of religious opinions may be traced to ignorance of the primitive faculties and their relations." P. 281.

"The low and miserable conceptions of God, formed by the vulgar Greeks and Romans, were the reflections of their own ignorance of natural, moral, and political science." P. 205.

The cardinal doctrine of Mr. Combe's creed has been fully expressed by saying, that the highest happiness of which man is capable, is to be obtained by conforming to the laws of his being as they are revealed in his physical and moral nature. In other words, that he is a machine containing within itself all the powers requisite to the perfect accomplishment of its design.

To the like effect is the flippant saying of one of the same school; "Nature, as we have seen her, is no saint. Her darlings—the great, the strong, the beautiful—do not come out of the Sunday-school, nor weigh their food, nor punctually keep the commandments."

To show Mr. Mann's devotion to the propagation of these views, we might turn to the memoir almost at random, and especially to his letters to Mr. Combe during a period of nearly twenty years; but we have no space for extracts. Suffice it to say, that he mentions, with unbounded pleasure, a fact, "most cheering to those who wait for the coming of the intellectual Messiah"—that Mr. Combe's work on the "Constitution of Man," had so unprecedented a sale. "If once the doctrine of the natural laws can get possession of the minds of men," he continues, "then causality will become a mighty ally in the contest for their deliverance from sin as well as from error. As yet, in the history of man, causality has been almost a supernumerary faculty; the idea of special providences or interventions, the idea that all the events of life, whether of individuals or of nations, have been directly produced by an arbitrary, capricious, whimsical Deity, alternating between arrogant displays of superiority on the one hand, and a doting, foolish fondness on the other, has left no scope for the exercise of that noble faculty."*

* "The great problem of the present age is to preserve the religious spirit whilst getting rid of the superstition and absurdities that deform it, and which are alike opposed to science and common sense."—English translation of "Renan's Life of Jesus."

Mr. Mann felt that it was his mission to overcome the influence of the foul spirit of orthodoxy, which had so long possessed the New England mind, so far at least as it had worked its way into the public schools; and to introduce, in its place, a system of Christian ethics, that he constructed in his youth, when his own mind was just disenthralled from a belief which "never prompted him to a good action, nor deterred him from a bad one."

The two forms of religious belief before his mind were, the Bible interpreted by Calvin, and nature interpreted by phrenology. The former he regarded as the grand enemy and obstacle to human happiness and progress—the latter as the precursor and promoter of both. He believed "the common school to be the greatest discovery ever made by man. Other social organizations are curative and remedial; this is a preventive and an antidote. They come to heal diseases and wounds; this to make the physical and moral frame invulnerable to them. Let the common school be expanded to its capabilities, let it be worked with the efficiency of which it is susceptible, and nine-tenths of the crimes in the penal code would become obsolete—the long catalogue of human ills would be abridged—men would walk more safely by day—every pillow would be more invitable by night—property, life, and character, held by a stronger tenure; all rational hopes respecting the future brightened."

It is obvious that these glowing anticipations were born of something more, if not better, than reading, writing, and arithmetic. There must have been elements in his scheme of reformation much more subtle and active than a knowledge of geography and grammar, else we are at a loss to explain his emotions when a Legislative grant was made for the support of Normal schools. "Language cannot express the joy that pervades my soul at this vast accession of power to that machinery which is to carry the cause of education forward, not only more rapidly than it has ever moved, but to places which it has never reached. This will cause an ever-widening circle to spread amongst contemporaries, and will project influences into the future to distances which no calculations can follow. . . The

GREAT WORK IS DONE. We must now use the power wisely with which we have been entrusted."

The duties with which Mr. Mann was charged, as Secretary to the Board of Education, were "to collect information of the actual condition and efficiency of the common schools, and other means of popular education, and to diffuse, as widely as possible, information of the most approved and successful modes of instruction." How much higher and wider he regarded the nature and scope of the office, his faithful biographer informs us when she says: "He thought human nature needed educating, and had been much maligned, and that it was only where circumstances had cultivated the earthly side of it unduly, that the divine element was temporarily obscured. Education was in his view a word of much higher import than that popularly given to it. Its function is to call out from within all that was divinely placed there, in the proportions requisite to make a noble being."

It was one of his maxims, however, that "every human being should determine his religious belief for himself." "It seems to me," he says, "that a generation so trained would have an infinitely better chance of getting at the truth than the present generation has had." "He was so sure that terror must be the first emotion excited by the knowledge of God, that it was long before he would consent that his eldest child should know of the existence of a higher power."

It surprises us not a little that an intelligent observer of the ways of children should have failed to see how often they accept and rejoice in their relations to the Heavenly Father. Indeed, it would seem that the benevolence, not less than the wisdom, of the Infinite One, prompted the employment of the term which denotes so tender and intimate an earthly relation, for the very purpose of impressing upon the infant mind the loving, paternal character of the Creator. Who doubts that innumerable infant voices are heard in the streets of the Celestial City, singing the praises of God and the Lamb, who lisped, with a loving faith, while on earth, the divinely authorized address to the infinite and incomprehensible Jehovah,

Our FATHER, *which art in heaven.*

Not less true than beautiful is the description of the

power of the unseen over infant minds, which the poet gives us—

> "So 'tis with children—speak to them of God,
> Of power omnipotent, of another life,
> And mark how they will listen—opening wide
> Their little eyes in wonder, as some doubt—
> A passing shade is painted on their looks—
> And then, at last, with touching faith, accept
> For truth the things they may not comprehend."*

But Mr. Mann had "no respect for bigotry," and who has? "The bigot," says his biographer, "may truly be said to be the enemy that always baffled him. The influences of bigotry clouded his childhood, took the blue out of his sky in his early manhood, and haunted his imagination all his life. He encountered it in all his endeavours to promote the cause of education at the East as well as at the West. He hoped to drive it before him over the prairies, though he could not always hunt it out of its hiding places in more conservative communities. He would exorcise it from the young, but it had become a part of the vitality of the risen generation."

In this last paragraph, we apprehend, lies the secret spring of his exultation at the "vast accession of power" which the establishment of the Normal school brought to the "educational machinery" under his control. The barrier which "orthodoxy" presented to the introduction of his schemes of education, he compared to the Chinese wall. The establishment of a college at the West, free from the influence of "old school theology," he regarded as "breaking a hole in the wall and letting in the light of religious civilization where it never shone before." "Think of this great State," he exclaims, writing from Ohio, "with more than two millions of inhabitants, and only one Unitarian Society." Two years later, he says, "The great West has been conquered, religiously speaking, from Black Hawk to John Calvin. So far as the religious dogmas are concerned, I would rather it would be Black Hawk's again. . . . . In this great State of Ohio, with nearly three millions of people, there are but three

* King René's Daughter.

Unitarian societies, and these are small. All the colleges, of a first class character, have a strong impression of Calvinism mingled with their daily food." His predominant purpose and effort were to break down this barrier, and not only to emancipate the minds of the rising generation from the bondage to "orthodoxy," but to bring them into the light and life of religious liberty—a sphere known to him and a few favoured ones, but hidden from the rest of the world. "He fed his imagination with the conception of a practical religious life, to be inspired into or evolved out of the young, to which he thought the generous heart of youth would respond warmly, if it could be disconnected from a religionism whose features make the young turn away."

Mr. Mann had evidently the same sort and degree of reverence for the author of the "Constitution of Man," that some people have for the author of Calvin's Institutes, though they would by no means dare to ascribe to John Calvin what Mr. Mann ascribes to George Combe, who "seemed to him to understand far better than any other man he ever saw the principles on which the human race has been formed, and by following which their most sure and rapid advancement would be secured." In the next century, Mr. Mann had "no doubt he would be looked upon as the greatest man of the age. . . . . He had an extent of thought by which *the next age is now present to him*, and he sees that his persecuted and condemned views will then be triumphant."

Horace Mann was as true a convert to Mr. Combe's theory of human capability and progress, as the staunchest orthodox man in New England can be to that of Calvin's theory of human salvation. But it is not easy to see how he could consistently claim the right to foist Combe and his philosophy on the public schools of Massachusetts, or on the rising generation of the West, and at the same time denounce as fanatics and bigots those who were equally honest in adopting the philosophy of Christ's gospel, and in wishing it might be propagated through all grades of education. Why is he any more a bigot who cannot tolerate "heterodoxy," than he who cannot tolerate "orthodoxy?" The one strives to maintain what he believes to be true, and the other, with equal zeal, opposes it as

false. If one is a bigot, are not both bigots? It is difficult to reconcile the depth and virulence of Mr. Mann's hostility to "orthodoxy," as he calls it, with his professed devotion to liberty of conscience. A few brief passages from his own journal or letters will serve as specimens of this hostility.

To his friend Combe, he says, "The orthodox have hunted me this winter as though they were blood-hounds and I a poor rabbit. They feel they are losing strength, and the period even for regaining it is fast passing out of their hands. Hence they are making a desperate struggle. They feel in respect to a free education, that opens the mind, developes the conscience, and cultivates reverence for whatever is good, without the infusion of Calvinistic influence, as the old monks felt about printing—'If we do not put that down, it will put us down.' My office duties and labours stand in their way. Hence my immediate destruction is for the glory of God. . . . . There are two classes, the one who are orthodox only by association, education, or personal condition. These may be good people, though they always suffer under that limitation of the faculties which orthodoxy imposes. The second class are those who are born orthodox, who are naturally or indigenously so—who, if they had had wit enough, would have invented orthodoxy if Calvin had not. I never saw one of this class of men whom I could trust so long as a man can hold his breath. These are the men who are assaulting me."

These are singular words from a man who was chief administrator of a system of public instruction, and who was then holding his office and receiving his pay, in part at least, from the very men whom he thus holds up to distrust and contempt.

"Just as I was looking for a little relief from the pressure of my labours, a child of sin and Satan come out, with a furious orthodox attack upon the Board of Education and myself, which I felt moved to answer."

"I sent you copies of a controversy, which, in the way of by-play, I had with one of the wild beasts of Ephesus, and a more untameable hyena I do not believe St. Paul ever had to encounter. Once a preacher of the annihilation of the wicked, then a Universalist, and now a Calvinist of the Old Testament

stamp. In believing in total depravity he only generalizes his own consciousness."

He spoke of his official career as "a twelve years' struggle to imbue the public mind with an understanding, not merely of the law, but of the spirit of religious liberty." So intent was he on this, that "even the importance of education itself seemed for a moment to be eclipsed."

"We have no orthodox lecturers of any celebrity among us. Emerson, Whipple, Parker ('Theodore,') T. S. King, Sumner, Pierpont,* &c., are all heretics of a very malignant type, when tried by the orthodox standard. The truth is, the iron bars of orthodoxy do not allow man to expand into the qualities indispensable for teaching the common heart of man."

"I feel more and more deeply what an unspeakable calamity a Calvinistic education is—what a dreadful thing it was to me. If it did not succeed in making me that horrible thing—a Calvinist—it succeeded in depriving me of that filial love for God, that tenderness, that sweetness, that intimacy, that desiring, nestling love which, I say, it is natural a child should feel toward a Father who combines all excellence. I see him to be so logically, intellectually, demonstratively, but when I would embrace him, when I would rush into his arms and breathe out unspeakable love and adoration, then the grim old Calvinistic spectre thrusts itself before me. I am as a frightened child whose eye, knowledge, experience, and belief even, are not sufficient to obliterate the image which an early fright burnt in upon his soul."

We do not cite these few out of scores of like paragraphs, to criticise or controvert them, but simply to show the *animus* with which the executive officer of the Massachusetts Board of Education entered upon and prosecuted his important duties, and the strength of his aversion to what was unquestionably the religious sentiment of five-eighths of the religious people from whom he derived his official support, and whose children were to be schooled, and their teachers trained, under his superintendence.

How far the revolution which Mr. Mann hoped and en-

* Late President of a Convention of Spiritualists in Philadelphia.

deavoured so earnestly to bring about in the intellectual habits and training of the children and youth of Massachusetts, was accomplished by his twelve years' service, it is impossible to say. Who knows by what influence, or at what stage of its life, the flavour or colour of fruit is settled? His power was felt, of course, in every grade of schools for teachers and children, through public addresses, and by the press, and can scarcely fail to be perpetuated perhaps for many generations. It may be revealed in the facility with which the cavils and quiddities of some vain philosophy are accepted, or in the boldness with which the truths of divine revelation are rejected. The vagueness of religious opinions, so deeply deplored by thoughtful men, and the old Athenian passion for spending "their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing," are the natural fruits of a system which recognizes no higher revelation of the Divine will than that of nature, or of human consciousness.

That Mr. Mann was disappointed in the measure of his success, and disheartened by the opposition and distrust which were manifested from time to time by those who could not adopt or countenance his theories, there is no doubt. But the cause assigned for resigning his office and accepting a seat in Congress, was his inability to sustain so great a burden upon his strength.

Passing over the interval of his two exciting terms in Congress,* we find him embarking with characteristic energy in that new and somewhat formidable enterprise—the establishment of a college at the West to be open to both sexes, and to be founded and conducted on the principles of his own philosophy. We do not use this expression derogately, but there is abundant evidence in the volume before us, and in the history

* It is to be regretted, we think, that evidence of *Mr. Mann's* bitter hostility to *Mr. Webster*, during his Congressional career, was not withheld. That eminent statesman, whatever his deficiencies, did good service for his country and for mankind; and we hardly know what apology can be framed for uttering over his grave such maledictions as this memoir records. "He consented to treachery, and to make his reward sure, proposed to do more villanies than were asked of him." "Webster is as corrupt a politician as ever lived." "He can do nothing but under the inspiration of brandy," "treacherous and perfidious, like Mr. Webster," &c.

of Antioch College to this day, to justify us in saying that the peculiar views of the school to which Mr. Mann belonged, were to predominate in the spirit, instruction, and discipline of the new institution.

It was his onerous task to take the enterprise *ab initio*, and to struggle, not only with the manifold difficulties that are expected in any such undertaking, but with those that grew out of its peculiar relations and circumstances. "The people of the West" he found to be "open, receptive, and mouldable," but "the ministers had a cast-iron epidermis so opaque and impervious that no sunlight can get into them—so absorbent that none is reflected from them, or all that strikes upon them is swallowed up and lost. The stronger minds which break away from orthodoxy, as the common rule, find no resting-place this side of general scepticism."

Mr. Mann went to the West in September, 1853, and for nearly five years gave himself with unremitting and exhausting fidelity to the interests he had espoused. During that time, he tells us, more than a thousand students were connected with some department of the college, and he adds that "among them all scarcely one who has been with us long enough to imbibe the spirit of the place, has left us a dogmatizer or a bigot." In other words, he had been, in a good degree, successful in sowing in the "open, receptive, and mouldable" minds of more than a thousand young men and maidens of the West, "a religionism from whose features the young would not turn away."

In the spring of 1858, the financial embarrassments which had before threatened to bring about the utter failure of the enterprise, ended in the advertisement of all the college property for sale at public auction. Mr. Mann felt that precious interests of "liberal religion" as well as of education, were in imminent peril. It would seem that some root of bitterness had already sprung up among those who had the government, or at least the purse-strings, in their hands. "Men who had pretended enthusiasm for him and for learning at first, fell away and became hostile when the failing fortunes of the college disappointed their desire to coin gold out of their unsold lands." Indeed, the picture which is given us of the state of

affairs at that juncture, would lead us to doubt whether the fruit of the new philosophy, though raised on that free virgin soil, was much to be preferred to that which is found in evangelical or "orthodox" enclosures. But its zealous cultivator was not to be deterred by difficulties, and with a fearless spirit he addressed himself to new efforts for averting the impending catastrophe. It was in vain, however. Difficulties arose in the college family, fomented, as we are told, by "outside women's-rights women." Heart-burnings were revealed in the Board of Directors. It was clear that the institution had been bankrupt from the outset, though the accounts were so kept as to conceal the fact. A new organization was attempted on a new basis and capital, "but under the same moral and religious auspices." It succeeded so far that temporary provision was made for current expenses, and a class graduated, receiving from Mr. Mann a baccalaureate address full of fervour and sympathy, but alas! for human nature, exceedingly "bigoted."* In this address to a company of young persons, just entering upon the stern realities of life, and needing the plainest and simplest rules of conduct, the distinguished educator, now past sixty years of age, presents the following picture:

"We are created with numerous appetences, all like so many eyes to desire, and like so many hands to seize their related objects in the external world. The external world superabounds with objects fitted to gratify and influence those internal appetences. And now these beings, fervid and aflame with these desires, are turned loose among these objects without any knowledge of what kind, in what quantity, at what time, they are to be taken and enjoyed, but with free agency to take what, when, and as much as they please. Bring these few elements into juxtaposition—the thousand objects around, the inward desire for them, the free will to take them, and complete ignorance of consequences, and how is it possible to avoid mistakes, injuries, errors, crimes?"

* Bigot, a man devoted unreasonably to a certain party, or prejudiced in favour of certain opinions.—*Johnson.*

"In philosophy and religion the *bigots* of all parties are generally the most positive."—*Watts.*

The apostasy of man, of which John Milton says,

> "Earth felt the wound; and Nature, from her seat
> Sighing through all her works, gave signs of woe,
> That all was lost—"

he describes to these young people as "what my very much respected but unfortunate great-grandparents, Adam and Eve did, in the garden of Eden at the time of the interview with a distinguished stranger in disguise."

He tells them that "the descendants of the Puritans" (that is a considerable proportion of the Christian people of New England) "are disposed to believe in the doctrine of vicarious atonement, because this getting everything and giving nothing is such a sharp bargain—very much the same plan on which the Puritan treated the Indians." And he sums up his instructions and exhortations by saying, "You have only to set your head right by knowledge, and your heart right by obedience, and forces, stronger than streams, or winds, or gravitation, will bear you up to celestial blessedness, Elijah-like, by means as visible and palpable as though they were horses of fire, and chariots of fire."

But our space is overrun. Mr. Mann's memory has many and warm eulogists. By those who adopt his theories he is regarded as the pioneer of a mighty moral revolution. "He was," in their view, "one of a body of far-seeing men who for nearly fifteen years have determined that there should be in the very heart of this country an institution which should not be second in ability to Harvard or to Yale,—and should, in the liberality of its system, and its freedom from sectional or sectarian restrictions, be able indeed to educate all comers. Biding their time in difficulties, working hard at the oar when the tide was in their favour, they have at last succeeded in obtaining a charter absolutely free from blemish, college buildings now ready for several hundred students, and a prestige of the first value through the whole western country,—and an endowment in real estate of $150,000, and in invested stocks a quarter of a million more."

The full direction of the college thus chartered and endowed

was recently offered to the present Governor of Massachusetts, whose distinguished public career, not less than his strong sympathy with Mr. Mann's views and projects, naturally suggested the selection. To induce him to accept the post his friends say—"they do not expect him to teach arithmetic to schoolboys, or to oversee the police of a boarding-school. They do expect him to appoint the fifteen or twenty professors whom the income of the college will at once sustain; to hold toward it the position which the vice-chancellor of an English university holds; to contrive the plans for its widest usefulness; to direct the efforts of the professors; to encourage and stimulate the pupils; and in general to advise the friends of the enterprise everywhere. They expect yet more,—that the energy of his character and the distinctness of his plans will make him one of the leaders of the education of the West; that not in that college only, but at every point where public opinion can be touched, his influence shall be found; and that this institution in its training of professional men, of men of active affairs, and of the teachers of the people, will introduce him to the large western world."*

This was the glowing picture which rivetted Mr. Mann's eyes, and to realize it he counted not even his life dear to him. Would that a spirit, alike brave, enduring and enthusiastic, animated the friends of a better and safer theory of educating the teeming millions of the West!

No one can read without deep emotion the few pages that record the giving way of his physical nature. However thorough our dissent from his opinions and plans, we cannot but admire his self-denial and public spirit, nor can we doubt the strength of his conviction that the system he so strenuously advocated had all the virtue he claimed for it. The failure of his imposing structure must be ascribed to the inherent weakness of the foundation. In dealing with the intellectual and moral nature of man it will not do to reject inspiration,† nor to

* *Boston Daily Advertiser*, September 28, 1865.

† "If inspiration be claimed for any one, was not Dr. Channing inspired?"—Mr. Mann's letter to Mr. Combe, April, 1849.

regard the great Teacher sent from God as only an "unspoiled human being."

We lay aside the volume with a mingled feeling of sorrow and surprise—sorrow that one capable of exerting so powerful an influence upon the interests of popular education, should have been led so far astray respecting its essential principles and ends—and with surprise, that the advocate and propagator of such radical errors in philosophy and religion should have received such unusual posthumous honours in the Old Bay State.

What more fitting inscription than the following could have been placed on the monument, erected, as it has been said, by the contributions of school children, and occupying a place in the State House enclosure, opposite a statue of the renowned *Webster*—

"HE DID WHAT HE COULD TO OBLITERATE FROM THE YOUTHFUL MIND THE NOTION OF THE PROVIDENTIAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD, AND TO BRING INTO EXERCISE THE NOBLE BUT NEGLECTED FACULTY OF CAUSALITY!"

ART. V.—*Imperfect Rights and Obligations as related to Church Discipline.*

THE distinction of Perfect and Imperfect Rights and Obligations has long been recognized in jurisprudence and ethics. It is simply this. A Perfect Right is one which may be enforced, and which we may apply adequate power to enforce, either personal, legal, judicial, executive, as the case may require. An Imperfect Right is so named because it cannot be so enforced. In equity it may be as valid for the possessor, as binding upon others, as a Perfect Right—morally, *in foro conscientiæ et Dei*, it may be as complete and obligatory as any other. But if those from whom it is due to us, refuse or neglect to render it, there is no remedy. We cannot realize or enforce it. However great the wrong of being denied this right, there is no help for it, except to bear it patiently, and commit our cause to Him who judgeth righteously.

Perfect and Imperfect Obligations are the correlatives of Perfect and Imperfect Rights. The right to any benefit or privilege presupposes the obligation upon some party, individual or collective, to bestow it. If they can be compelled by the power of law to discharge this obligation, it is perfect. If they cannot, it is imperfect. The obligation of a parent to barely support his dependent minor children, if he have the means, is perfect. The obligation, if he be a man of large wealth, to expend it in giving a proportionate education, social position, and establishment in life, or to leave them a suitable inheritance, is imperfect. He cannot be compelled to discharge it unless he chooses.

Other examples of these respective kinds of Right and Obligation are such as the following. The right of the poor and helpless to the support which the State provides for paupers is perfect, for it can be, and is enforced. The obligation of the rich to contribute their portion of the taxes for this purpose is perfect, for it can be enforced. But the claim of the poor and distressed to the charitable assistance of the opulent, is an imperfect right. The duty of bestowing it is an imperfect obligation, for it cannot be enforced. A child has been adopted, and trained, and treated, by those who assume towards it the place of parents, in such a way as to create a reasonable expectation of being their heir, and a moral right to become so. But this right and the correspondent obligation are imperfect, because they cannot be enforced without positive testamentary provision on the part of these parents *quasi*. The man who fell among thieves had a right to the same kindness from the passing priest and Levite which he received from the good Samaritan. They too were under a like obligation to bestow it. But the right and the obligation respectively were alike imperfect. They could not be enforced. So the correlative right and obligation of gratitude from the beneficiary to the benefactor are imperfect. The right of the servant to the usual gratuities or perquisites of his situation, beyond the stipulated wages, for his faithful services, is in like manner imperfect, because the obligation to confer them is imperfect.

It must not, however, be understood that such obligations are of course morally imperfect, because they are legally so, or in-

capable of human enforcement. In the eye of conscience and of God, they may be absolute and perfect. The obligation to fulfil lawful promises implied or express, to minister according to our ability to the helpless and suffering, to cherish gratitude to benefactors, in every way to do justice and love mercy, is complete in itself and before God. It is only imperfect with respect to the power of human enforcement. But it is perfect, in that it can and will be perfectly enforced, either at the hands of the obligee or his Surety, at His tribunal, who will lay justice to the line and righteousness to the plummet; who will judge every idle word and the secrets of the heart; who will cause all to appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, to receive according to the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad. The priest and the Levite might not answer before human tribunals for their wicked and heartless neglect of the helpless victim of violence and robbery, whom they passed on the other side; but they assuredly are held to account for it at the bar of God.

It should be observed, however, that many of these imperfect obligations are such, because of their indeterminateness, which renders it difficult to see precisely where obligation begins and ends, and thus proportionably abates the guilt of error and consequent delinquency in the premises. The nature and scope of these indeterminate duties we shall soon see cause to develope at greater length. We now only call attention to them provisionally, for the purpose of pointing out, that they give rise to degrees of the stringency, and, in this sense, of the perfection of obligations, in certain cases, even in the eye of conscience and of God. Thus the precise amount which one ought to give in charity, as well as the objects on which it ought to be bestowed, may be involved in considerable obscurity and uncertainty. To err, or to come short of the full measure of duty here, is obviously a very different thing from the commission of theft or blasphemy. The obligation is, in a sense, less stringent or perfect in the one case than the other; and the failure to discharge it duly, involves proportionally less guilt.

Corresponding to the foregoing distinctions, is that between the adjective and substantive *right*. To bestow charity upon

the needy may be very right on the part of the thrifty or the wealthy. But the former have no right to it, in the sense of a perfect, legal, or demandable right. If they have a moral right, still they cannot realize it, unless it please those from whom it is morally due, to discharge their obligation. It is right for parents, not only to feed and clothe, but to be kind, tender, and affectionate to their children, to train and furnish them, according to their circumstances and social position. But it is not a right which children can enforce.

It is obvious that this distinction of perfect and imperfect rights and obligations has a wide application to virtues, sins, and delinquencies of "professing Christians," and the power of the church to enforce the one and prevent the other, on pain of excommunication. In short, it is implicated with the whole subject of conditions of church-membership, terms of communion, and the grounds, kinds, and degrees of discipline. That is to say, there are many Christian traits and deeds which are truly obligatory in the sight of God, that cannot be enforced; and many faults which incur Divine condemnation, but cannot be prevented by church censures or exclusion from communion. It is the right of the church, and the obligation of its members, that they all be real believers and saints. But this right and obligation are imperfect so far as regards the possibility of enforcing and realizing them, through any church courts, or any human power whatever, ecclesiastical or civil. It is also obligatory upon all church members, and the church has a right to claim, that they shall be not merely Christians, but exemplary, blameless, zealous, humble, active, devoted Christians; full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy. But how many church members are sadly deficient in these traits, who cannot, nevertheless, be compelled to manifest them by any ecclesiastical discipline or peril of excommunication? Nay, who could not be excommunicated by any process which would not expose genuine and even excellent Christians, whom Christ has received, to a like penalty; or incite divisions and contentions that would jeopardize the very existence of the church.

Hence it follows, that there are sins and faults in Christians which cannot be made a ground of exclusion from the com-

munion, whatever other agencies or forms of discipline may be applied to check or repress them. Indeed, to say otherwise, would be to say that Christians, in this life, may attain sinless perfection. If it is true, that they who say they have no sin deceive themselves, and the truth is not in them, it is also true that, if there be a church, it must be composed of those who are deformed with sins which are no bar to communion. The church has a right to claim of its members that they be holy, harmless, undefiled; without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. But it is not a perfect right. There are spots and wrinkles which it is no function of compulsory church discipline to remove. There are others which come within its scope to purge away. There are sins, the right to exclude which from the church, is perfect; others, respecting which the right is imperfect. This distinction, whether clearly seen or not, is at all times acted on by every church which pretends to maintain discipline at all. Indeed, no church could live which wholly set it at naught. It would be utterly extirpated, or convulsed and shivered to atoms. Yet, we apprehend that a due understanding, appreciation, and application of this distinction, would be of inestimable benefit in showing more clearly where attempts at church discipline, tending or amounting to exclusion from the communion, ought to begin and end, and in preventing those unwarranted attempts at it, which so often prove abortive, or worse still, disastrous and ruinous; which, so far from promoting the vigour and efficiency of church discipline, tend to bring it into disrepute and impotence, even within its legitimate sphere.

All this is beautifully signified in the parable of the tares and the wheat. The tares are to remain, "lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up the wheat also. Let both grow together until the harvest; and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." Matt. xiv. 28. To the same effect, our Book of Discipline, chap. iii. 3, "An offence gross in itself, and known to several, may be so circumstanced, that it plainly cannot be prosecuted to conviction. In such cases, however grievous it may be to the pious, to see an unworthy member in the church,

it is proper to wait until God, in his righteous providence, shall give further light; as few things tend more to weaken the authority of discipline, and to multiply offences, than to commence process without sufficient proof."

The principle involved in the foregoing quotations from Scripture, and from our own Book, is essentially the same in each. It is simply this: Ecclesiastical discipline is to be kept within limits, and prosecuted upon principles, which do not expose true Christians to the danger of loss of church standing, or exclusion from the communion. Such tares are to be allowed to grow together with the wheat, as cannot be rooted out without "rooting up the wheat also." So the charge not to institute process, even against the gravest offenders, "without sufficient proof," is imperative, because such discipline exposes the innocent, the true followers of Christ, to excommunication. Here we reach the limit of offenders and offences, amenable to extreme ecclesiastical discipline; and of the kinds of judicial procedure which can be brought to bear against them. We may not shut out, or adopt any principles or modes of procedure which shut out from the church and table of the Lord those whom he has received. We have no option in this matter. Besides the monstrous absurdity and awful assumption of poor mortals attempting to "fence" out from the Lord's table those whom he has received to himself, he, who alone is Head of the church and Lord of the conscience, has bound us by his explicit command—"Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not unto doubtful disputations." It is given as the sufficient reason why we should shun all uncharitable judgments in regard to any one, "that God hath received him." (Rom. xiv. 1—4). "Receive ye one another as Christ also received us." (Rom. xv. 7). Indeed, the fact that throughout the New Testament, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is exhibited as the only and the sufficient condition of admission to the sacraments, precludes the need of further argument.

Not less decisive to this effect are our standards.

The only requisites which the Directory for Worship permits us to demand evidence of, in candidates for the sacraments, are "knowledge and piety." And the knowledge required is simply that which is "sufficient to discern the Lord's body," to

know the meaning of the sacraments, and to ensure more than a blind faith. (Chap. ix. 1—3.) Ministers are required to "invite to this holy table, such as, sensible of their lost and helpless state by sin, depend upon the atonement of Christ for pardon and acceptance with God: such as, being instructed in the gospel doctrine, have a competent knowledge to discern the Lord's body, and such as desire to renounce their sins, and are determined to lead a holy and godly life." (Chap. viii. 4.)

Nor does the statement in the Book of Discipline, (Chap. i. 2, 3,) that the "end of discipline is the removal of offences;" and that an "offence is anything in the principles or practices of a church member, which is contrary to the word of God; or which, if it be not in its own nature sinful, may tempt others to sin, or mar their spiritual edification," militate against this view. For first, discipline is not limited to judicial processes and penalties culminating in excommunication. There are many modes of discipline in which the authority of the session is brought to bear for the removal of offences, such as solemn warning, expostulation, entreaty. (*Id.* chap. i. 5.) "It becomes the rulers of the church, therefore, to take into view all the circumstances which may give a different character to conduct, and render it more or less offensive; and which may, of course, *require a very different mode of proceeding in similar cases, at different times, for the attainment of the same end.*" Secondly, while this definition of offence is made so broad as to prevent any evasion of ecclesiastical responsibility by those guilty of scandal or heresy, on the ground of mere technicality, yet it is to be interpreted consistently with the whole requirements of our standards in the premises. But interpreted in connection with the section following, which is stated as an inference from it, it is to be understood, rather negatively than positively, as designing to exclude every other ground of church discipline, than asserting that every thing, whether directly or indirectly, nearly or remotely, contrary to the word of God, or tending to lead others to sin, is an offence that should bar from communion. Section iii. is: "Nothing, therefore, ought to be considered by any judicatory as an offence, or admitted as a matter of accusation, which cannot be proved to be such from Scripture, or from the regulations and practice

of the church, founded on Scripture; *and which does not involve those evils which discipline is intended to prevent.*" Besides, according to other portions, whatever offences may be subject to discipline in other forms, it is very clear that none are to operate as a bar to communion but those sins, which, if unrepented of, are counted incompatible with Christian character, viz., scandals. The only class of professors desiring to come to the Lord's Supper, who "ought to be kept from that sacrament by the power which Christ hath left in his church," are the "ignorant or scandalous;" and these only "until they receive instruction or manifest their reformation." (*Larger Cat.* 173.) Baptized persons trained to a pious life, "when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body, ought to be informed that it is their duty and privilege to come to the Lord's Supper." (*Dir. for Worship* ix. 1.) By "scandal" is to be understood immoral and unchristian conduct, so flagrant that persistence in it is incompatible with Christian character, or a credible profession of piety. Thirdly, the evidence already given that our standards require us to receive to communion with ourselves and the Lord, at his table, all whom he has received to communion with himself, prove the same thing. It proves that the definition of "offence" and the methods of discipline to remove it, must be understood in harmony with this great principle.

Such has been the actual historic attitude of our church on this subject. So have its courts expounded the Scriptures and our standards, and administered its discipline. In 1729, the General Synod avowed the principle of "admitting to fellowship in sacred ordinances all such as we have grounds to believe Christ will at last admit to the kingdom of heaven."

Recently the General Assembly declared, "we have ever admitted to our communion all those, who, in the judgment of charity, were the sincere disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ. If, in some instances, stricter terms have been insisted on—if candidates for sealing ordinances have been required to sign pledges, to make profession of any thing more than faith, love, and obedience to Jesus Christ—these instances have been few

and unauthorized, and, therefore, do not affect the general character of the church."

All these proofs of the doctrine of Scripture and our church concur to one issue. The church has a right to piety in her members. She has a right to claim of them an exemplary deportment, abstinence from all evil and appearance of evil; and those fruits of holiness which adorn the doctrine of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. They are under obligation thus to honour Christ in all things. But the right and the obligation are imperfect, in the sense already explained, when we pass beyond certain limits, viz., the limits within which discipline can be prosecuted to excommunication, without excluding true Christians from the household of faith and table of the Lord.

The cases in which offences, sins, or faults of professing Christians cannot be made a bar to communion are two-fold.

I. Where the offence itself, if duly proved, and unrepented of, is a righteous ground of excommunication; but it cannot be proved, except by methods which would expose to conviction those innocent of the offence charged. Direct violations of the fundamental principles of religion and morality—enunciated in the decalogue—of course, if proved, debar from communion till renounced. Such also are denials of the fundamentals of Christian doctrine, or violations of Christian duty which plainly subvert the profession of Christianity. "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, no not to eat." (1 Cor. v. 11.) "Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. vi. 9–10.) So we are commanded to "mark them that cause divisions and offences among you contrary to the doctrine ye have learned, and avoid them." (Rom. xvi. 17.) "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." (Titus iii. 10.) These are samples of sins that sever from Christian and church communion. Yet these must be proved by evidence and modes of procedure that would not ex-

pose the innocent. And, in regard to some of these sins, how exceedingly difficult, often impossible, is this? Take the various forms of licentiousness for example. How rarely can they be detected? And, if sins that make themselves known, how often is it impossible *judicially* to ascertain them? There is covetousness. How often is it palpable and undeniable, and yet incapable of being judicially proved in ways which would not convict the innocent? Nay, is not this so difficult, if not impossible, that in practice it is never, or almost never, attempted? When the Apostle John says: "Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" he gives a test of piety. Yet it is such that the lack of it cannot be judicially ascertained, in any ordinary case, on any principles that would not expose persons of true piety to excision from the church. Where these and like offences can be proved on sound principles of evidence, of course, they are incompatible with Christian character and a bar to communion.

II. The second great class of duties of imperfect obligation, inasmuch as the church cannot enforce them, are those which are requisite to the symmetry and beauty, but not to the being, of Christian character. Their absence, or the presence of the contrary sins, is not, therefore, decisive evidence of the want of piety, or of disqualification for communion. Such sins may be great deformities. But inasmuch, even if proved, they do not disprove the existence of a sincere love of the Lord Jesus Christ, they are no evidence that He has not received those defiled with them, or that we should not receive them. In this class are, of course, included all those infirmities which still cleave to good men, and deform the excellent of the earth—defilements and delinquencies which they, most of all, bewail. Their coldness, negligence, unbelief, worldliness, indeed their defects of inward love and outward service, are often most all known and felt by themselves. But aside from these (with reference to church discipline) vague generalities, there are several classes of faults, which, though, as far as they go, unchristian, are not evidence of the want of piety. They may proceed from the absence of religion. And they may exist, in spite of its presence. Therefore they cannot be made tests of Christian cha-

racter, or of a right to the communion. To this class belong violations of indeterminate duties—which thence become themselves indeterminate transgressions, impossible strictly to mark out or enforce. Into this category fall,

1. Duties of kindness, charity, liberality. Men may sin as really and fatally, to their own eternal undoing, by the neglect of these virtues, as in any other way. A man of ample means or great affluence, is bound to give largely in charity, and may lose his soul if he do not. Yet who can prescribe how largely? Who knows all the private claims upon him? Who knows how much he does in private? Who knows that he may not be husbanding his resources in order to establish some great charitable foundation, which otherwise would fail? Who knows enough, in short, to prove that he may not be a follower of Christ, notwithstanding? In all this, to his own Master he stands or falls, not to any church court. There is the charge to lay by in store, on the first day of the week, as God hath prospered us, for purposes of religion and charity. But who can determine how far God has prospered any one, and how much he should lay aside, but his own conscience? The same reasoning applies to the amount contributed by different men to the support of religion. How many refuse to pay for this purpose at all in proportion to their means, *i. e.*, simply their just dues, who cannot be constrained by any pressure of ecclesiastical discipline? How rarely can a petulant, irascible, vindictive, unforgiving temper, thoroughly unchristian as it is, be reached by judicial process? How many professors, even among those who make great pretensions, and have high public standing for piety, fall into such sins, which no ecclesiastical penalties can prevent, without shattering the church to atoms?

Want of Christian activity, zeal, and decision, is a grave sin. Yet, how impossible in any ecclesiastical process, to draw the line between the utter absence, and that low state, of these virtues, which is compatible with, at least, a feeble state of piety in the soul. Indeed, sins of omission, as a class, are less within the reach of church discipline than sins of commission. Imperfect obligations lie especially in this region. The sin of the priest and Levite, of unkindness, ingratitude, want of liberality, all shortcomings whatever, are sins of omission. How important

a place they occupy may be seen in the fruitless fig-tree, the lamp without oil, the man who lacked one thing yet, the slothful and unprofitable servant, the doom of those who have not the love of God in them, and who profess not Christ before men, the final consignment to everlasting punishment of men for what they have *not* done unto Christ in the persons of the least of his brethren. And let it be observed, how difficult it is to convict men, at any human tribunal, of that omission of those ministries to the cause or people of Christ, which will consign them to everlasting fire? Or if they are convicted of the omission of them in some measure, that it should be demonstrated to be of that degree which proves absence of piety and debars from communion? To deal decisively with this class of cases is seldom within the competency of man who looketh on the outward appearance. It is mostly, if not entirely, the exclusive prerogative of God, who looketh on the heart; and alone knows what omissions of this kind proceed from, and prove, that carnal mind which is enmity with God.

2. Another class of sins or errors, which neither prove nor disprove piety in the soul, consists of mistaken applications of right principles. It is a duty to obey the powers that be. This may be accepted and acted on, in all good faith, by those who err as to what is the real government in authority over them. To have been a tory in the Revolution, or a rebel in our late rebellion, was no proof of the possession or want of piety, because it was perfectly compatible with fealty to what they honestly conceived to be the legitimate government. Men may agree that it is their duty to provide for their own, so far as in their power, according to their situation and prospects in life. But they may, as honestly, differ widely as to the manner of carrying out these principles, and what constitutes a suitable provision and allotment for them. There are many cases of mixed morality in which the same act may have proceeded from a good or a bad motive, according to the light in which it was viewed by the actor; and, therefore, *per se*, neither evinces the presence nor absence of piety. This is very largely true of acts in themselves indifferent. Gifts may be bestowed upon the poor, from the purest Christian charity, or for the sake of mere popularity; or in order to purchase their votes; or where it is

known that the gift will be spent upon the means of intoxication; or for a deadly weapon to be thrust at an enemy. Intoxicating liquors may be taken for the sake of inebriating excitement, or because they are supposed to be, within the limits of temperance, conducive to health and vigour.

3. This brings us into the region of sins of ignorance. In regard to these, much confusion and perplexity prevail. All feel that it is no excuse for profaneness or blasphemy, to be ignorant that they are wicked. Such ignorance only evinces depth of depravity. So in a large measure of all the duties of the decalogue, and of the fundamentals of Christian doctrine, faith, and life. Here the principle applies, in its utmost fulness, "Woe to them that call good evil and evil good; that put light for darkness and darkness for light." Here it is principles and duties, in themselves moral and religious, that are concerned. Ignorance is no excuse for the contrary sins, because it is itself inexcusable. Yet, even here, sins committed ignorantly are less flagrant, and closer to the Divine mercy and forgiveness, than those deliberately committed against light and knowledge. This is the teaching of the human conscience, and of Him too who is "Lord of the conscience." Did not he pray for his crucifiers, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do?" And did not Paul say of himself, "who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly, and in unbelief." (1 Timothy i. 13.)

But there is a clear distinction between these cases, in which the ignorance or error respects the principle, and those in which they relate to matters of fact. A strong illustration of this would be the case of killing another through mistake, by one who abhorred the crime of murder; or that of our soldiers in the war shooting down each other, as sometimes happened, mistaking them for the enemy. The reader may also recur to the numerous illustrations of this kind which we have just presented.

This distinction between error or ignorance, as to moral principles and facts governing the application of those principles, and as to the guilt respectively of the two, has not been overlooked by ethical writers. Ignorance as to facts may be culpa-

ble in proportion as it is wilful, or might have been overcome by due diligence. Says Whewell, "Hence, as a general distinction, Moralists pronounce *Errors of Fact*, when not accompanied with negligence, *to be exculpations* of the actions which they occasion; but *Errors of Principle, not to be exculpations.* And in this distinction they agree with the Jurists: who lay down these two cardinal maxims: *Ignorantia facti excusat: Ignorantia juris non excusat.* Ignorance of the fact is an excuse; ignorance of the law is no excuse. A man is not criminal for not directing his actions by a fact, which he did not know from observation or testimony; and which he could not know any other way. On the other hand, ignorance of the law cannot be accepted by the law as an excuse."

4. Here, too, we find the clew to the solution of the question, how far the moral quality of an action is determined by the intention of the doer. 1. A bad intention, or want of good intention, necessarily vitiates all actions prompted by it, be they good, bad, or indifferent, in themselves. A man who means wrong, or does not intend to do right, of course, sins. And hence, whether known to man or not, there is an inherent vitiosity in all acts not animated by faith and love. 2. An act in itself morally evil, cannot be cured, or made right and innocent, by any good intention in doing it. Men are not excused for blaspheming, lying, stealing, denying the faith, because they mean well, or think it right, or that good may come of it. They have no commission to do evil that good may come. Nor can they make evil good by thinking or calling it so. 3. In regard to actions indifferent, *in themselves* neither good nor evil, their moral quality is determined almost wholly by the intention with which they are done. The extent, however, to which this is true, depends upon the closeness of their implications with things moral or immoral, and the facilities for knowing this relation. Thus it is, in itself, a thing indifferent whether one spends two or ten thousand dollars per year. But if the effect of spending the latter sum would be obviously to disable from paying one's just debts, or to enervate and corrupt a family of children, then it is culpable to be ignorant, and to act in ignorance of this, just in proportion to its palpableness. But ordinarily, such consequences are not obvious, and the intention

in doing acts indifferent, determines their moral quality. If a man fixes his residence in a city, thinking thus to give his children greater advantages for education, business, and usefulness, and they resort only to its theatres, saloons, and dens of vice, thus plunging themselves down to ruin, the character of his choice is determined by his intentions, not by its consequences. This is clearly the apostle's teaching in regard to things indifferent. The moral quality of the action depends on the intention of the doer. "I know, and am persuaded of the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean in itself; but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean it is unclean. . . . . Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth. And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. xiv. 22—23.) Though "an idol is nothing," yet to eat "with conscience of the idol," and "as a thing offered to an idol," defiles the conscience. (1 Cor. viii. 7.) But how seldom, if ever, are such sins of ignorance or intention within the scope of church discipline?

5. Thus we come into the sphere of expediency, so prolific of indeterminate duties and imperfect obligations. Expediency applies not to actions, *per se*, good or evil, but to those which are, *per se*, indifferent. There are countless actions, not in themselves good or evil, which we ought to do or to shun, as they appear likely to promote or hinder what is in itself morally good or evil. These are the things which we ought to do or avoid, on the ground of expediency. When the apostle says, "all things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient," the "lawful" things here specified, are things indifferent. To things intrinsically good or evil, expediency is irrelevant. It would be absurd to speak of its being expedient or inexpedient to love and obey God, to speak the truth, to do justice, love mercy, to profess Christ, &c.; &c. These things are intrinsically and for ever binding, independently of all expediency. Not even an angel from heaven could set them aside. But the amount which one spends in comforts and luxuries is a thing indifferent. Moral obligation in the premises varies with circumstances. He who spends in unnecessary indulgences what ought to be reserved for charity, or to avoid

bankruptcy, or to provide for the necessary support of his family, present and prospective, does what is indeed "lawful (in itself, aside of its consequences,) but not expedient." But what man or church can prescribe to him how he shall spend his money, or inflict penalties upon him, if he spends it unwisely or improvidently? Who shall determine what is expedient for him? If this prerogative were transferred to others, it would be an intolerable infringement of that liberty, in the use of our own, which gives it its chief attraction, and constitutes the great incentive to its acquisition. In like manner, who shall determine the style and equipage, and general modes of living, which are right, proper, or expedient for other people? Sumptuary laws are proverbially impracticable by civil government. Their execution involves an espionage and petty despotism that are intolerable and fatal. They are still more impracticable in the church. And yet, what prodigious violations of Christian duty, what depravation of morals, and injury to religion, result from improvident and extravagant expenditure? Again, no church court can pronounce any particular style, gorgeousness, or cost of dress, incompatible with Christian character, or a bar to communion. And yet, it is undeniable that the present enormous extravagance of female dress, often aggravated by a corresponding general extravagance or costliness of living, especially in our great cities, tends to sap the very foundations of social life, and of morality and religion, as implicated therewith. Considerate young men cannot, and dare not, enter the married state, without generous, and even princely incomes, such as few can obtain. Hence the vast and increasing numbers who live in perpetual celibacy, with the inevitable consequences of such a state of society. Who can doubt that there is great sin in these things, yet of such a kind that it cannot be extirpated or even reached by church discipline? These are things, in which, whatever may be true in the general, it is impossible to fix the charge of scandal, or of being incompatible with piety, in particular cases. Here we may not judge another man's servant; to his own master he stands or falls.

6. One topic under this head has greatly exercised different branches of the church for the last quarter of a century, viz.,

The relation of the manufacture, sale, and temperate use of intoxicating drinks to church standing and discipline. It is agreed, on all hands, that drunkenness or intemperance is, *per se*, a sin, which, unrepented of, should debar from the communion. It is agreed also, that the mere manufacture, sale, or sparing use of drink, that, used in excess, may intoxicate, is not, in itself, a sin. But it is argued that such making, selling, and using of these drinks, as a beverage, is the occasion of all the drunkenness that exists, without any countervailing benefit to justify it; that it gives rise to all the immense evils, physical, moral, and religious, of the intemperance that desolates the country, while it does no good. Hence, if not sinful in itself, it is the occasion of others sinning, and that to their eternal undoing. To do that which leads to such results, is alleged to be inconsistent with Christian character, and a proper ground of exclusion from the church. It is alleged that, when any "so sin against the brethren, they sin against Christ," (1 Cor. viii. 12,) and, therefore, ought to be debarred from communion.

Such is the substance of the argument which has had extensive currency among Christian people, and been endorsed by some ecclesiastical bodies in this country.

Our first remark upon this is, that while the apostle (Rom. xiv. and 1 Cor. viii.) charges us to use our Christian liberty, with regard to things indifferent, in a spirit of charity, and for the edification of the brethren, he, none the less, invests us with this liberty, and requires others to respect it. If the strong are not to be regardless of, or uncharitable towards the weak, neither are they to be judged or condemned by them. It is true, on the one hand, that "it is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." But what is the power which the apostle would enlist to ensure this generous self-sacrifice for the good of others? Is it church discipline, and the terror of excommunication? or the impulses of Christian love? These questions answer themselves. Suppose any "eat flesh," when, in the judgment of others, Christian charity should lead them to abstain from it. What then? Let the apostle answer. "One believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that

eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." (Rom. xiv. 2—6.) This, beyond all question, is decisive, that while we ought to use our Christian liberty, in things indifferent, aright, yet we are bound not to surrender, but to preserve that liberty. Its highest and best Christian use is a duty of imperfect obligation, with respect to enforcement by human tribunals. It is God's prerogative to enforce it, and not for us herein to judge another man's servant. "Why should our liberty be judged of other men's consciences?" (1 Cor. x. 29.) Indeed, it may become a duty for Christians sometimes to assert their liberty, in these matters, by a practical exercise of it which would otherwise be unnecessary, in order to counteract misguided efforts to bring them under a yoke of bondage. It may be even necessary to do it, at the risk of calumnious misconstructions and imputations. There are limits to the checks upon our liberty which may be imposed by the duty of conciliating, or not scandalizing, weak Christians. If they attempt to forge unscriptural fetters and bonds for the conscience, which interfere with our freedom in serving God, and holy living, it is our duty to refuse them. A higher than we incurred the groundless opprobrium of being a "wine-bibber and gluttonous, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children." This suggests a second unanswerable reply to the argument in question, viz., that if all making of intoxicating liquor to be used as a beverage is a sin, then our Saviour committed a sin in his first miracle; and if any, even the least use of such drinks, as a beverage, be a sin and a bar to communion, then the drinking of the wine made by him to be so used, was a sin and bar to communion. Further, while the Scripture repro-

bates drunkenness, and makes it a bar to communion, it will hardly be claimed that it puts all use of "wine which maketh glad the heart of man" in this category. There must be some mistake about arguments and principles that involve such consequences. The case is plain. Intoxication is a sin—which, persisted in or unrepented of, should exclude from communion. So he who knowingly supplies liquor to be used for purposes of intoxication, or keeps a haunt of drunkenness, is a partaker of the sin. But even this is more difficult to be dealt with than intoxication itself. And so the further we get to the more remote agents in producing it, the more difficult it is to establish a sinful participation in it. Those who manufacture, and sell it, may claim that they do so to supply it for lawful and not for illegitimate purposes; to be used, not abused; that there are manifold purposes, medical and hygienic, as well as in the arts, besides its moderate use as a beverage, that are lawful, for which it is required to be made and sold. Then again, many excellent and judicious people suppose that the free and ordinary use of native fermented liquors, wine and cider, would banish or greatly lessen the use of the more fiery and acrid beverages, which are so prolific of drunkenness, and thus indirectly promote temperance. These opinions may be wrong. We stand in doubt of them. But, right or wrong, they relate to matters in which a difference of opinion is no legitimate test of Christian character. We do not believe that excommunication on such issues is the Lord's way of preventing intemperance, or that it will have such a tendency—quite the reverse. For ourselves we have long felt called upon to abstain and, as far as possible, to induce others to abstain from the ordinary use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. We devoutly wish that the use of them as a common beverage might be banished from society. We cordially adopt the Assembly's deliverance—"Especially should there be the frequent warning to the young and inconsiderate," touch not, taste not, handle not, "accompanied by a corresponding example." But we believe that these results are to be reached by persuasive appeals to the conscience, and the constraining power of Christian love, and not by making a new, unauthorized, and divisive term of communion. It is quite time it were understood that there are

manifold evils, sins, and shortcomings, which it is entirely beyond the power or province of church discipline to eradicate. So far as things indifferent are concerned, we "are called unto liberty, only we must not use our liberty as an occasion to the flesh; but by love serve one another." (Gal. v. 13.) It is our duty to use our liberty for the edification of ourselves and others on the one hand; and on the other, to vindicate and maintain that liberty against the efforts of those who would turn it into a yoke of bondage. Suppose a large party should arise, who should maintain that it is a sin for Christians to spend more than a certain moderate sum annually for clothing, while the demands of Christian charity are so imperative. Suppose they should procure votes to this effect to be passed by ecclesiastical bodies; and, in fact, so far as we can see, such a curtailment of expenses, in order to give what is thus saved to the cause of Christ, would be productive of great good. But suppose any think and act otherwise. What then? Is it to be, or can it be, enforced by church discipline?

In the same manner we believe, that, if the great body of the people, especially of Christian and moral people, would abstain from the use and sale of intoxicating drinks, great good and no evil would result therefrom. But what if many, including some of the most eminent, devoted, liberal, and exemplary members of our own and other churches think and act otherwise? If they judge it proper, and not unchristian, to drink a glass of wine, cider, porter, occasionally, or even daily? We may regret it. But can we make it a test of Christian character or term of communion, or enforce compliance with our views in that way? By no manner of means.

The same principle applies to the manufacture, sale, and use of tobacco. The writer of this is of that class who believes that the prevalent use of tobacco is productive of great evils, physical and moral; that it has a great influence in developing an appetite for strong drink, and thus promoting intemperance, with other evils; and that it would be an unspeakable blessing to the church, the nation, and the world, if we could bring about its universal disuse. Multitudes of good men are of the same opinion, and have succeeded in procuring the utterance and endorsement of this opinion by some ecclesiastical bodies.

But multitudes of others are quite otherwise in theory and practice. Would it not be quite absurd and monstrous to try to reach or extirpate this evil by ecclesiastical discipline? Could it be done without "rooting up the wheat also," and extirpating the church itself?

More than a quarter of a century ago, a case came before the Consociation of Fairfield West, in Connecticut, on appeal from the action of a church which had sustained a complaint against one of its members for "selling distilled spirits as a drink for persons in ordinary health." On the question whether such a charge was a ground of ecclesiastical action, that body unanimously adopted the following minute, framed by the Hon. Roger M. Sherman, who was a member of the body, and one of the first Christian jurists which this country has ever produced, withal an earnest advocate of total abstinence. This they did after saying: "they do earnestly beseech and solemnly charge all members of churches who so make, vend, or use distilled spirits, to desist from a practice thus injurious to society and perilous to themselves."

"The act charged is 'solely the practice of selling distilled spirits as a drink for persons in ordinary health.' It is not charged that he has so sold distilled spirits as to produce intoxication, or has sold it to drunkards. The rights of a church like those of a civil government, are of two classes, viz., perfect and imperfect. Perfect rights are such as can be enforced by adequate penalties; such as the right of requiring members to abstain from theft, lying, &c. These can be enforced by the heaviest censures of the church. Imperfect rights are such as can be asserted, but not enforced by penalty if not yielded; such as bountifulness, attending social meetings, avoiding frivolity and evil communications, &c. Of this latter sort, we deem the acts under consideration to be, in the present state of things, in many of our churches."

This principle might be elucidated through various lines of illustration, at much greater length. But if we have thus far succeeded in making ourselves understood, our main object has been accomplished. It has been shown that there is a wide range of Christian virtues which, while they are the proper outworkings of Christian principle and love, cannot be enforced

by the exactions of church discipline; of sins and evils which cannot be purged out by ecclesiastical censures or excommunication. To say that a given course of conduct is sinful, is not, as some suppose, proof that it exposes to excommunication, or can be thus extirpated from the church, without "rooting up the wheat also," and rending the church into fragments. Evils, faults, sins, must be borne with, which can only be extirpated by procedures that would expel the true members of Christ from communion with him and his people, at his table.

It does not follow that the church and ministry are not to bring their appropriate powers to bear for the removal of sins and faults which are beyond the province of the last penalties of church discipline. By argument, persuasion, expostulation, entreaty, example, a living ministry and church, will, by the power of the Holy Ghost, make continual and mighty progress in elevating the tone of piety, benevolence, liberality, self-denial, zeal, and activity on the one hand; and in rooting out sins, errors, and unchristian practices and fashions on the other. How much, for example, has been done in this way to raise the standard of Christian liberality, and to abate even the temperate use of intoxicating drinks? How much remains to be done in these respects, and also to exorcise the covetousness, worldliness, selfishness, and voluptuousness which still infest the church?

Church censures culminating in excommunication have one aim; to remove from the church those offences which, being capable of judicial ascertainment, are clearly inconsistent with a credible profession of piety; and to exclude from the communion those whose conduct is not only unchristian, but unchristian in such a sense, as, if persisted in, to certainly evince the absence of piety. Carried beyond this sphere, instead of subserving, it defeats its proper end of purifying the church, and invigorating religion. It is itself thus greatly weakened and brought into disrepute. It divides, debilitates, and destroys. It roots up the wheat not less than the tares, and, from being a power for edification, becomes a power for destruction. The clear apprehension of the distinction between perfect and imperfect rights and obligations, we think will assist not a little in enabling us to define the proper sphere of ecclesiastical dis-

cipline; and to avoid those misapplications of it, which have so often brought it into disrepute, neutralized its efficacy, distracted the church, and, instead of promoting religion, inaugurated the reign of envying and strife, confusion and every evil work.

ART. VI.—*Strauss and Schleiermacher, in their biographies of Jesus compared.* By P. HOFSTEDE DE GROOT, D. D., Prof. of Theology in the University of Groningen. Translated from the Dutch.

CARL SCHWARTZ, in his ingenious work, *History of Modern Theology*, where he treats of Schleiermacher, relates that Strauss, tutor at Tubingen, once more visited the university of Berlin, mainly because he desired to attend the celebrated lectures of Schleiermacher on the life of Jesus; and he adds that these lectures, full of disorganizing scepticism in analyzing and of sagacity in combining, gave the principal impulse to the destructive work of Strauss. This account of Schwartz is in some respects modified, but on the whole confirmed by what Strauss himself, recently in an essay, and now in his *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, communicates. He did not indeed, he tells us, in the winter of 1831, 1832, which he spent in Berlin, himself hear Schleiermacher deliver these lectures; but yet he made from two copies a copious extract. From his account of these lectures given in his last *Life of Jesus*, we receive moreover the impression that they both stand on one foundation; yet with this difference, that Schleiermacher moves cautiously and reluctantly, like one walking on a yet untrodden glacier, whilst Strauss sets his foot firmly and courageously, like one passing over ground with which he is familiar. Strauss remarks concerning them: "Schleiermacher's lectures on the life of Jesus have not, like his other lectures, yet been given to the public. They gave so little encouragement to the conservatism which has ever prevailed in the school of Schleiermacher; they were especially against the

urgency of the mythical view of the evangelical history a bulwark so untenable; they were by the white metallic image of Schleiermacher's theology so greatly feet of clay, that it was deemed advisable to conceal them. These lectures had also done their work, as a numerous audience at the master's feet had imbibed the views which lie at their foundation, and spread them abroad in their writings. In nearly all the elaborations of the evangelical history, even to the most recent time, we are at each step reminded of Schleiermacher's Life of Jesus. He passed also in this respect for an oracle, for which, by the ambiguity of his whole being, truly an enigma, he was eminently fitted."

With still greater asperity he expresses himself respecting Schleiermacher in the essay, in which he treats of the resurrection of Jesus according to that thinker. According to the extract which he there gives of Schleiermacher's lectures, we should, could we confide in our informant, be obliged to regard the great theologian as very small, yea, as very contemptible, as then his reflection must have been very limited, his scepticism unbridled, his courage very faint, and his deceitfulness outrageous.

Concisely and clearly does Strauss express his judgment of the man, when he begins the section on Schleiermacher thus: "Neither Herder nor Paulus had more clearly and definitely comprehended the impossibility of a miracle, the inviolability of the order of nature, than Schleiermacher."

The impossibility of a miracle, the inviolability of the order of nature—these are the watchwords of Strauss. Does Schleiermacher herein agree with Strauss—then, indeed, do they stand on one foundation. In the fundamental principle there must then be perfect unity between them; only will the timid master have applied the principle less consistently, less like himself, than the pupil who has much more courage to come out undisguisedly for his opinion.

So will any one be obliged to judge, whose acquaintance with both scholars, in their elaboration of the life of Jesus and in their whole mode of thought, is derived from Strauss alone. But, whatever assurance Strauss may give, if we have sought to know Schleiermacher himself from his own works, we cannot

believe that the report by Strauss touching his *Life of Jesus* is accurate and just. Were it so, then the great thinker and upright Christian must in these Lectures have apostatized from himself: and this no one acquainted with him will credit, save on incontestable evidence. Such to him is not the assurance of Strauss.

A happy turn has been given to this matter. When Strauss wrote that Schleiermacher's pupils had deemed it advisable to conceal these lectures, one of their number had already been three years engaged in preparing them for the press, so that they might be given to the public shortly after the appearance of Strauss; whilst it appears that the delay of their publication was to be ascribed, not to the apprehension of the pupils for the good name of their master, but to the want of good manuscripts. Now we can judge of Schleiermacher in these lectures from his own words, and we no longer depend on Strauss's report respecting him.

But there is more reason to rejoice in the publication of this work. In some respects it appears to be the most important of Schleiermacher's writings. By this is not meant that these lectures greatly advance our scientific contemplations of Jesus' life; time has advanced much, and also from Schleiermacher so much has been drawn, that it would indeed be a marvel should a new light on the life of Jesus arise to us from these lectures. Every one who has taken them in hand with such an expectation will have laid them aside, on the whole dissatisfied. But they powerfully assist us to better understand Schleiermacher himself. What he has in his *Dogmatics* and elsewhere given more abstractly, appears here in vivid visibility; certainly elsewhere the notion, here the history is dominant, but both serve as forms to place in the clearest light the one vital principle of his whole theology, Jesus Christ. The shady sides too of his mental character strongly appear, especially needless scepticism and inability to transport himself into the spirit of the lower classes. But be this so: hereby too is this book a much shorter and safer way to attain to a full understanding of Schleiermacher than we have thus far possessed; let every one who would learn to understand him, begin here his study. Here all is simplicity, clearness, depth. Here, in accordance with

the remark of the editor, "Schleiermacher appears *entire* according to all sides of his knowledge from the depth and fulness of the faith revealed to him, of which neither the right nor the left side of his opponents seems to have a suspicion. His views are at the same time expressed with so much frankness, that he is throughout liable to be variously misapprehended, and thus lays himself open to hostile attacks."

On this account chiefly is the work of Schleiermacher of sufficient importance to be made in some measure known to our readers, especially in contrast with Strauss and with the judgment of Strauss respecting it. We proceed therefore to offer some observations on *Strauss and Schleiermacher, in their biographies of Jesus compared.*

We direct attention *first* to both biographies in general, in order *afterward* to make these generalities visible in certain particulars, and *in conclusion* to point out the great difference between them.

The philosophical principle of Strauss is, that the miraculous or the supernatural is impossible. To prove this he does not deem necessary. Our age, the civilization of our time, science, he says, is convinced of this. Only in section 24, entitled, *The Notion of a Miracle*, he seeks to adduce a proof for his assertion. It amounts to this, as the caption of this section intimates, that no satisfactory *idea* of a miracle is to be obtained; from which it must appear, that there is no *miracle*. This he does not say in so many words; unconsciously he confounds the apprehension of the thing with the thing itself. He is now so deeply engrossed in thinking, in willing to understand and comprehend, that whatever lies beyond that, for him has no existence. This is both here and everywhere the philosophical foundation of theology and of all science, as with Hegel, so also with Strauss: all must be capable of being comprehended or conceived; what cannot be comprehended or conceived, does not exist. Our reason is the limitation of being. He says expressly in that section, *Der Wunderbegriff*, in demonstration of the impossibility of a miracle, first: page 147, "It is the task of historical investigation, not barely to ascertain *what* has happened, but also *how* things have proceeded one from another. But it must abdicate the last, noblest part of its task, as soon as it grants

any place to a miracle, as just this interrupts the procession of one thing from another." Let us now apply this philosophy respecting history to the origin of the human race and of the earth in its present state. Historical investigation will then be *obliged* to ascertain how these have arisen without a miracle; but as it *cannot* do this, it must deny that origin itself; for that origin cannot without a miracle be acknowledged; but to a miracle no place can be granted; there is, therefore, no origin of the human race and of this earth in its present state. This philosophy then gives thereof no explanation whatever.

After this Strauss endeavours in that section to show, that the notion of a miracle suits no philosophical system whatever, not even the theistic, from which he omits the government of the world. But suppose that it has never been thus far able to find a place in any system of philosophers: it is not on that account to be banished, unless we may presume that the insight of philosophers into the nature of things is the limit of their existence.

Similar utterances everywhere abound in the book of Strauss. We cite but one more. On page 38 he declares that he will then first acknowledge the superhuman greatness of our Lord Jesus Christ, when it is made *comprehensible* to him, *why* in the domain of religion alone there can be such an only person. The historical fact he will therefore acknowledge as true, if philosophy can construe it as necessary.

The historical principle, or rather the unhistorical supposition, wherewith Strauss would prepare us to believe that there are in the Gospels many fables, is this, that at the time of decaying heathenism, of self-reforming Judaism, and of formative Christianity, thus in the age of Jesus and the apostles, in the circles influenced by religion no correct view existed of what history is, but a dominion of the imagination was universal, so that we are by no means as certain respecting the life of Jesus as about that of Socrates, yea, not more certain than about that of Pythagoras, who lived six centuries before Jesus. Just the reverse is true, there never was earlier or later a more historical time among Greeks, Romans, and Jews, than the first century of our era.

The conclusion of the philosophical principle and of the un-

historical supposition, applied to the life of Jesus, is with Strauss, that the Gospels, being full of miraculous accounts, abound in myths or popular tales, though some history, that of the wise and virtuous rabbi Jesus of Nazareth, lies at their foundation.

What are now the principles of Schleiermacher?

His philosophical point of departure is this, that the supernatural or the miraculous, as commencement of a new order of things, is necessary; but in the progress of that order gradually becomes natural. The first of our race were miraculously created by God, he says; but their children and remoter descendants are born in a natural way. So also the second Adam, Jesus Christ, has by a miracle of God arisen without error or sin in the human race; but the miraculous acts of such a person and the establishing of the Christian church by such a founder are the natural effects of a supernatural cause. This is his principle, in his *Dogmatics* and elsewhere constantly expressed; and now also again in his *Leben Jesu*, so that it is a perfect untruth, what Strauss says of him, that Schleiermacher maintained the impossibility of a miracle; he maintained its necessity. Thus he is far also from making the ability to comprehend, the standard of truth. Much that is incomprehensible is admitted by him as true. The limits of thought he by no means holds with Strauss for the limits of being. There is much, much even in the Gospels related according to truth, to which we by our thinking cannot attain.

The historical principle of Schleiermacher is equally the reverse of that of Strauss. The time of Jesus and the apostles is to him a perfectly certain historical time. There are indeed in the first three Gospels popular tales or myths, especially about what happened at the birth of Jesus; but this is owing to the fact, that (according to him) these writings in their present form are of later origin. But their chief contents are perfectly certain; for the Gospel of John is from Jesus' bosom-friend and in the relation of Jesus' acts and communication of Jesus' discourses wholly credible.

The sum of these two principles, applied to Jesus' life, is with Schleiermacher this, that we, though there are in the first three Gospels embellishments and additions, have yet a perfectly cer-

tain knowledge of the chief matters of Jesus' life, especially from the pen of the accurate John.

Do we yet ask in general, if there is not then a great correspondence of the two scholars in their biographies of our Lord: then the answer is, that there certainly is, and that in the free historical criticism, belonging in equal measure to both. We are acquainted with it in Strauss: in Schleiermacher we find it equally strong; he expresses it just as undisguisedly, that we have in the Gospels writings of men, to be subjected to the same free criticism as all other books. Yea, both have done so much to the criticism on the accounts of the Evangelists respecting Jesus' life, that they have not yet arrived at a proper life of Jesus. As to Schleiermacher, criticism is with him not only profound, free, fearless, all-sided; it is also, often audacious and exaggerated; it often sees difficulties where they are not. Schleiermacher is frequently unable to transport himself out of his own spirit and mind into the world as it now is. His clear intellect, his firm will, his likeness to himself, he not unfrequently supposes, though unconsciously, in all men, so that he cannot admit folly and inconsistency when narrated of others.

But if there arises from this a great correspondence between him and Strauss, this does not prevent them from being in general antipodes. With the one the supernatural is impossible, with the other, necessary; with the one the pith and principal matter of the evangelical history is invented, with the other true.

From what is general we pass to some particulars. When we see the accounts of the birth of our Lord criticised by Strauss and Schleiermacher, we find here a great correspondence. With Strauss nearly all is legendary, with Schleiermacher equally so. He, too, has all manner of difficulties respecting these accounts. They consist, according to him, of two series of narratives (by Matthew and Luke), which are not to be reconciled. Jesus must not, indeed, yet *can* have had a human father, *can* have been Joseph's son. He even declares himself to be sceptical, where no original reports seem to him to exist. But if Schleiermacher goes thus far hand in hand with Strauss, he yet maintains, and here is a very great difference, that by one or other positive act of God care has been

taken, that in the arising of Jesus' life nothing sinful should find place in him; and that in a specially ordained, marvellous manner, the conviction that Jesus should be the Messiah, was spread and confirmed before, at, and after his birth. Both points, it is known, are assailed by Strauss.

The account of Jesus in the temple, at the age of twelve years, is with Strauss an unchristian invention, as he infers especially from the legends relating to the childhood of Augustus, Cyrus, Moses, and Samuel. With Schleiermacher it is beyond all doubt a true report, to the contemplation of which he devotes sixty pages, more than one-tenth part of his whole work. He certainly finds this account wholly in harmony with Jesus' personality, as that is later manifested; he here reads in Jesus' mind and spirit, when he began to develope; he sees here the whole of Christianity already as in its germ presented to our view. Then already, he says, Jesus apprehended that he stood in a wholly peculiar, to other men strange relation to God. For he calls God *his Father* in a wholly peculiar sense. Before Him we do not find God thus exhibited in the Old Testament, and if Jesus speaks afterwards of God as the Father of all men, God is so according to Jesus only through Him, so that even the apostles have not God as their Father in the same sense as He. There is a difference between Jesus and all other men, and this not only in degree, but also in kind. In Christ the divine spirit is something original, in Christians something communicated. Christ, and Christ alone, is, and always was from childhood, sinless and infallible. He is, therefore, himself foundation and centre of the gospel, and not the faith *of* Jesus, but faith *in* Jesus is the principal thing for us.

All this Schleiermacher discusses in connection with the account of Jesus, at the age of twelve, which opens to him a view into the inmost of this wholly peculiar man, when he as a boy began to be conscious who he was, and his divine greatness began to send forth its first rays.

This greatness manifests itself afterwards much more strongly in the public life of our Lord, and is most conspicuous in his miracles. With Strauss, Schleiermacher agrees, that no acts contrary to nature were performed towards or by Jesus. He,

too, is zealous against the violation of the order of nature; but when he finds occurrences, perfectly well established by eye-witnesses, related, which do not harmonize with the order of nature known to him, he does not reject the credibility of the narratives; no, this stands fast: but he confesses his ignorance how to understand them, and thus makes history not dependent on his knowledge of nature or philosophy, as Strauss does. Miracles of every kind, even the most assailed, such as that at Cana and the raising of Lazarus, he maintains as facts, which to us are miracles. Does he endeavour as far as possible to find a correspondence between the works of Jesus and of ordinary men; does he seek to penetrate the operation of Jesus' divine power in human forms, he is never on that account willing, which Strauss always is, to set aside the supernatural. "Never have I supposed," he declares, "that the proper worth and nature of Christ could be reduced to the ordinary domain of nature." He refuses to explain the miracles as wholly natural occurrences; although it is natural or comprehensible that they are so, when we have regard to the higher nature of Christ. His contemplation of Jesus' miraculous works closes with these words: "It has become clear to us, that from such an existence, as we acknowledged that of Christ to be, operations in the domain of human existence are possible, which are not possible of another man."

As to the doctrines of Jesus, we only point to that respecting his own person. Schleiermacher is of opinion with Strauss, that He ascribes to himself no preëxistence. He does not indeed think, that in the Gospel of John the utterances of Jesus respecting it are adulterated, but he supposes that they must be exegetically apprehended otherwise than of a preëxistence. Beyond this the two German scholars stand diametrically opposite to each other in their apprehension of Jesus' person. Is He with Strauss only an excellent man, who in the domain of religion signifies about as much as Socrates in that of philosophy, Aristotle in that of science, a man with predecessors and successors, who in some respects surpass Him, not an Only One, not a person specifically distinguished from all other men: with Schleiermacher He is an altogether only person, without his like before or after Him, who drew his

knowledge of divine things not from the prophets, but from himself, and in his fulness possessed all that which the apostles have developed, without being able to surpass, or reach, or even comprehend Him, so that they have nothing save out of the fulness of Jesus, and this they have been very far from exhausting. Yea, for all mankind He, He alone is the source, even yet, of the holy, wise, loving life of God, which exists incipiently in his church. So Jesus exhibits himself, and rightly so; for Jesus Christ was what he professed himself to be.

To three more particulars we must direct attention, to Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension. Strauss thinks, as is known, that Jesus died, but did not rise again, nor ascend to heaven. But it is not unimportant to compare Schleiermacher's own words with what Strauss tells us of his contemplations on these topics.

Strauss presumes to write of his teacher: "In the history of the resurrection he agrees in all points with the natural explication of Paulus (of Heidelberg). Jesus was not entirely dead, and by special divine disposal, that is, by perfect accident, without human intervention, restored to life; moreover, by just such an accident was the stone removed from the sepulchre by men who knew not that Jesus was in it, and thus He came out of it." Thus speaks Strauss respecting Schleiermacher. And, how did Schleiermacher himself speak in the very year 1832, at the commencement of which Strauss was in Berlin? "Whether the body of Jesus after his death underwent dissolution, is uncertain. But the wound inflicted by the spear is a proof that Jesus was really dead, so that hastening of his death by breaking of the legs was in his case unnecessary. It was in no case a sham death."

And what does Schleiermacher say of the resurrection? The accounts respecting it by John are those of an eye-witness. Moreover, the account of Paul is perfectly credible. 1 Cor. xv. Further: "All our accounts necessarily suppose the resurrection of Jesus, so that we must accept as a fact, what in general is not to be doubted." After having spoken of the appearances of Jesus, which he regards as short visits of Jesus living on earth, but no longer having daily intercourse with his friends, he continues: "Thus nothing incomprehensible remains, save

the resurrection itself of Jesus. But so it is with the whole appearance of Christ on earth; the commencement was a miraculous act, but the continuance something entirely natural." "Christ, therefore, by his resurrection returned to a real human life. The appearance of the contrary is explained by the perfectly explicable resolve, to mingle no more with the world, but to remain with his disciples alone." "The truth of the second life of Christ we allow, as a fact established by all reports, to pass for a real life."

We have here a strong proof, that the communications of Strauss are not to be received on his word as true. What copies must he have had to make Schleiermacher say something wholly different from what he actually said? Reluctantly we impute it to bad faith: but can we here do otherwise?

With respect to the ascension of Jesus, Schleiermacher has indeed given occasion—yet no just cause—for a sentence of disapprobation. He certainly has multiform and strange ideas of it, mostly derived from this, that it is expressly related only in the Acts. The Lord was indeed exalted to heaven, but whether in order to this any removal of his body from this earth took place, appears to him doubtful. A second death would not have been impossible, but,. not being related, is not to be received. What took place he does not pretend to say. Here the great man is weak or even lame. Yet Strauss has no right first to make this idea of Schleiermacher still more sceptical, and then to say: "In this lameness issues the representation of Jesus' life by Schleiermacher. It has failed of the object at which it aimed, viz., to give equal satisfaction to faith and science." This is unjust, for Schleiermacher closes with these words: "For him, who does not accept the altogether only in the appearance of Christ, remains this one and always the same task: to point out in all miracles how they are to be explained by natural laws, and by these also to explain his last life. The issue is always the same: bungling: whereby in the fashion of making suppositions an absolute lack of criticism prevails. Just this is a proof for the higher in the appearing of Christ, for the certainty that He is a higher being, an *ens sui generis*, that all attempts to place him on a lower grade completely fail. There exists meanwhile (for us all) a task, which (by me) has not been

finished, and to whose completion we can only approximate: this, that we acknowledge this (only, higher), but so treat all particulars, that it can be seen, how it *resting* on a supernatural foundation has yet *become* perfectly natural."

This is Schleiermacher's profound conclusion, of whose significance the one-sided Strauss has no appreciation.

Having thus placed Strauss and Schleiermacher in their biographies of Jesus, as well in general as in certain particulars beside each other, we desire in conclusion to point out in certain traits the great difference, yea, the perfect conflict between them.

Strauss is evidently a pantheist, and Schleiermacher, however pantheistic (in his philosophy) he may often be, is in heart a believing Christian; so that the one as negative intellect-man denies everything that he does not comprehend; the other as positive soul-man acknowledges also that which urges itself upon him as positive, though he does not comprehend it. This contrast we have already noticed.

Both set out from a previously fixed position: Strauss from this, that a miracle is impossible; Schleiermacher from this, that we believe in Jesus Christ; Strauss, therefore, from a subjective philosophical system, Schleiermacher from objective Christianity.

Strauss, moreover, draws a boundary line between the natural and the supernatural, which with him is equivalent to counter-natural or unnatural, and this last is with him all that we, according to the natural forces known to us and working before our eyes, cannot comprehend. Schleiermacher asserts, that the supernatural is not counter-natural or unnatural, but the natural thus far remaining unknown to us; so that the boundary-line cannot be drawn between natural and supernatural. He will not on that account, however, deny the facts that present themselves as supernatural, but acknowledge them as soon as they are communicated by competent witnesses, and seek in some measure to comprehend them, and, in so far as this does not succeed, respect them as thus far incomprehensible facts.

On the soul of Strauss is written: "Comprehend all, believe nothing; what Christians only believe and do not comprehend

is error, mistake, or deceit." Dogmatics must thus, as he in his work, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre*, attempted to do, serve for the solution or removal of all Christian doctrines. In Schleiermacher's soul was deeply engraven what he placed as motto for his work, *Der christliche Glaube:* "Non intelligere, ut credam, sed credere, ut intelligam." And his faith rests on an immoveable fact: the existence of the Christian church and its institution by Jesus Christ. Thus he did not place science foremost, as something on which faith depends, as if there existed a possibility that this faith should succumb to science. No, with him faith stood, as the respiration of the soul, as immoveably foremost, as with the naturalist our corporeal breathing through the lungs. Neither of these two respirations begins or ends with our knowledge of it. But yet it is our duty as far as possible to know or comprehend them. If, however, faith and science seemed to conflict, then with Schleiermacher the latter yielded, not the former. Faith was to him a beacon on the coast, according to which he must direct the course of his ship, even should he be unable to make it correspond with *his* calculation of longitude and latitude.

As to the person of Jesus Christ: He is with Strauss a branch proceeding from the tree of humanity: *merely human*, not divine, not supernatural, but a production of nature. Jesus is with him the product of his time, of his nation, of circumstances, of the movement in the spiritual domain in that age; just as, for instance, the principal personages in the French Revolution were products of that revolution, which they have indeed directed, but only as exponents, not as creators of the public sentiment. Jesus is thus a creature, not creator; effect, not cause of the Christian church. Strauss adds various remarks on the philosophical, moral, and religious condition of Jews and heathen in Jesus' time, which are well adapted to make us see, that that age was susceptible of the gospel, and thus explain its diffusion, but accomplish absolutely nothing towards explaining its origin, or even that of its doctrines. With Schleiermacher Jesus is a new scion, grafted by God in the tree of humanity; thus indeed *purely human*, but not merely human as Strauss maintains; purely human in consequence of the operation of the divine or supernatural principle

in Him. He is not the product, but the producer of a new time, the founder of a new institution, the source of a new intellectual and spiritual life, that still constantly flows forth from Him to the increasing blessing of the world.

The necessary effect of the views of Strauss is, that with them the church falls. In the closing lecture of his earlier *Life of Jesus* he acknowledges the conflict between his views and the existence of the church, and in his *Dogmatics* he proclaims aloud, that the church must disappear before the state. What will then become of religion, does not appear. Perhaps it will then become a recreation for those who still set a value on it, as is poetry now in our community. In any case there is no more place for theologians. This book of Strauss is also not written for them. They are treated with great asperity; he turns to the people; refuted by the theologians, he knows not where to find any remedy save among the masses, who are now to decide on these questions of philosophy, history, and criticism! "Flectere si nequeo Superos, Acheronta movebo." The effect of Schleiermacher's theology is just the opposite, viz., the upbuilding of the church. In his *Encyclopædia* he reduces all education of the theologian to this aim, viz., that of being qualified to serve and preside over the church. Also in his *Life of Jesus* he gives to this end rich and profound hints; what he adduces on the training of the apostles and the *gemeinschaftstiftende Thätigkeit* of Jesus, is most important, but we do not touch upon it now. On the whole, this is a side of Schleiermacher's theology which is still very rarely adverted to by Protestant divines, that he always sets out from the *existence* of an institution, which must have had a founder—from the existence of the Christian church, which demands a Christ. What is in this church, is *from* its founder, and thus *in* its founder. Ullmann has excellently developed this fundamental thought of Schleiermacher's system in his beautiful treatise, *What does the founding of the Christian Church by the Crucified presuppose?* But Strauss takes no notice that this is a fundamental idea with Schleiermacher, although this idea is most important. No serious endeavour on his part is to be found to explain the existence of the Christian church. He has no conception that we cannot account for the *deed*, the *fact*

of Christianity from *ideas* of thinkers, that Plato's *speculation* on a state has not yet been able to effect the *founding* of a state. Properly he knows no church. Paul, he says, deified Jesus and this was continued in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the fourth Gospel. Paul did so, as he allowed himself to be borne upward in the air without ballast in a balloon filled with fancy. We are unable to conceive who could seriously find in the clear and dialectic Paul a fantast, and still less to comprehend how by a voyage in a "*phantasie-gefullte Ballon in die Lüfte*" an edifice could have been erected, such as the Christian church, which has for centuries stood on immoveable base and foundation.

In spite of all this, Strauss makes it appear as if Schleiermacher was fundamentally in agreement with his main principle. He assures us, when he begins to speak of his teacher: "More clearly and definitely had neither Herder nor Paulus comprehended the impossibility of a miracle than Schleiermacher." Designedly untrue Strauss is not, but he absolutely does not comprehend Schleiermacher. It is with him as with one who has blue, red, or yellow glasses before his eyes and now sees every thing red, yellow, or blue. As long as he has no suspicion that those spectacles colour every thing, and so does not lay them aside, he must indeed see as they necessitate him. The glasses of Strauss are the understanding; not the intellectual power in general, but the lower faculty of knowing, in contrast with reason and mind. Taking understanding in this sense, we see in Strauss an intellective man, a one-sided intellective man only, reasoning on every thing. Certainly with him all begins, all proceeds, and all ends with reasoning, comprehending, thinking. It profits him nothing for understanding the things of God's kingdom, that he is an acute thinker, eminent stylist, and great scholar. A capitalist, who is rich and knows how to augment his treasures, derives from this ability no advantage whatever, to acquire also taste for and appreciation of the fine arts, to comprehend generosity and self-sacrifice, and to conceive of patriotism. To him Apollo Belvedere is a piece of stone, Mary's act of love a waste.

Schleiermacher and Strauss stand externally very near each other, and, what is still more, the latter thinks he understands

the former. Yet he does not. Such a thing has often happened. Aristotle did not understand the ideal of his master Plato, Flacius Illyricus did not understand the freedom of Luther. Wolff meant to arrange the ideas of Leibnitz, and he petrified the ingenious thoughts of his master into lifeless dogmas. Fichte imagined that he was following Kant, and became, nevertheless, the opposite of that critic, a dogmatist. Just so Strauss comprehends nothing of Schleiermacher's life of faith, and his criticism therefore on the New Testament seems to him lame, his person an enigma.

On the whole Schleiermacher is not easy to comprehend; he certainly is absolutely unintelligible to a wholly dissimilar nature. Moreover, great defects are always very easily pointed out in him. In this *Life of Jesus* two things are especially embarrassing. First, an often unnecessary scepticism. But this harmonizes with his whole manner of viewing every matter. He is always critical, views things from all sides, has much to say for and against. He is a genuine dialectician in the sense of Plato. And this gives with many a difficulty also very great advantages. Secondly, a frequently recurring complaint of the incompleteness and the difference between the Evangelists, so that we do not know much, or are even uncertain respecting many circumstances of Jesus' life. That that incompleteness and that difference exist, is perfectly true, but is this a sufficient ground of complaint? of complaint so excessive that what we know well and certainly, may, therefore, as is the case with Schleiermacher, be in good part overlooked. He laments that we do not know more about Jesus' birth, education, maintenance, daily labour, appearances after his resurrection, and similar matters, and in connection with these things he overlooks much that is important and well known; for instance, Jesus' mode of instruction, his use of similitudes, the education of his apostles according to their character in general and of each in particular, and much more of that nature. But on taking notice of all that we do not know, he thus not seldom overlooks the principal things which we know well. It is as if an astronomer complains that we cannot visit a single heavenly body beyond the earth, not even our own moon, and neglects, as we cannot know this, that, and the other thing, to reduce to

a whole what we know well. It is as if a connoisseur constantly complains of the painter, because he has given dark colours to various parts, is bent on knowing what those dark corners contain, and then does not attend to all the light parts, which the painter intended to bring out. Respecting these things he may not murmur. The great artist had his reasons, which we must respect, whilst we thankfully receive from his hand what he gives, and study and seek to understand this. The Evangelists are not indeed such artists; they have often given concisely what happened to Jesus. But above them stands Divine Providence, that has given us through them so much respecting Jesus as we need to know in order to find in Him the Saviour of the world. What is not related, was certainly less necessary or unnecessary, would perhaps with many have drawn away their attention from the necessary. Let us then not complain of the dark with the light, of the unknowable with the clear in the portraiture of Jesus' life.

Yet Schleiermacher even in this book abounds in profound and sublime thoughts, by which the shrewdest and most upright are impressed, and from which they derive refreshment of mind and heart, and whereby they are stimulated to wholly new investigations. He very often appears like an eagle, that flies high above forests and fields of snow, and surveys the earth in its parts and its connection. Who can follow his flight?

But every one can follow and understand Strauss. His wisdom is the everyday understanding and the audacious denial of nearly every thing that is elevated above the virtue of the saloon and the wisdom of the street. And since this understanding is introduced and commended by singular shrewdness and very comprehensive learning, he makes impression on many, all whose bloom and fruit fall off, when touched by his icy breath. With this remark we close: *if Strauss does not understand his countryman whom he personally knew and had as his instructor*, how easily may he then err, when he must comprehend a Luke or John, or, indeed, Jesus himself.

For this he wholly lacks the spiritual organ.

ART. VII.—*Observations on the difference between Renan, Strauss, and Schleiermacher's Life of Jesus.* By P. HOFSTEDE DE GROOT, Professor of Theology in the University of Groningen. Translated from the Dutch.

THE *Life of Jesus* by Renan, published in the summer of 1863, was succeeded a half year later by one elaborated by Strauss, and this was a few months after followed by one from Schleiermacher. Thus in one year three biographies of our Lord from three celebrated men. They were not, however, composed at the same time. The work of Schleiermacher might have been published thirty-two years ago. There is, however, an adequate reason why it was not. The subject therein contained was treated by him in his lectures. From his hand were found after his death only short notes. What his hearers had recorded was often imperfect, and indistinctly written, so that his friends, the editors of his posthumous works, for a long time were unable from different copies to compose a whole. Finally they obtained a complete and distinct manuscript which, after comparison with what had already been collected, is now published by K. A. Rütenik.

It is important to compare these three works with each other. It would be so on account of their authors, if they had written the life of some other person, for instance of Pythagoras or Socrates, of Luther or Napoleon; how much more now that the life of Jesus is their subject!

Let the question first be answered: What is the general view taken by each of *Jesus' person?*

Renan is an admirer of the French Revolution of 1789. Every great movement in the history of the world, thus also the reformation of the church in the sixteenth century and the founding of Christianity itself, he compares, consciously or unconsciously, sometimes expressly and often tacitly, with the French Revolution.

As this revolution was not the work of a single man, but proceeded from a concurrence of circumstances, from the whole range of thought and from the passions of France in the former

century, which conducted the spirit of the French nation to that revolution: so must Christianity, according to him, also be the result of a general fermentation in the thoughts and opinions of the nations, especially of the Jewish nation in that age, which was full of Messianic expectations. Jesus may thus, in Renan's spirit, be compared to a Mirabeau or Sieyès, who, in 1789 and later, were the best exponents of what was passing in the spirit and mind of the French people in general. As they did not, however, bring the revolution to an end, Renan seeks another example with which to compare Jesus, in order to understand Him, and finds it in Mohammed, as he acknowledges himself towards the close of his *Introduction.* Just as it was with him, so he ascribes to Jesus also different periods, first of amiability, afterward of violence; first of fanaticism, then of hypocrisy. Therefore after the manner of Mohammed Jesus also effected a religious revolution. Thus we obtain a portraiture of Jesus' life, but one that is in conflict with itself, an absurd mixture of truth and falsehood.

With such a view Strauss cannot agree. The external manner in which Christianity first appeared, its world-conquering power, makes not on him such an impression as on the much more vivacious Frenchman, who is politician and man of the world. Strauss is a German, is a close student, is a thinker. In contemplating Jesus his attention is not so much attracted by the revolution in the history of the world effected by Jesus, as by what Jesus *thought.* Jesus is to him with respect to religion, what Socrates was in the philosophic, Aristotle in the scientific domain. He borrows this comparison from Renan; but Renan did not remain true to it. And Renan's comparison of Jesus with Mohammed, Strauss does not accept. Now Socrates and Aristotle were with Strauss above all thinkers. The moral-religious ideas of Jesus are thus to him the principal thing.

Again, it is wholly otherwise with Schleiermacher. He is also thinker, but finer, deeper, and many more-sided. He lived in a greatly excited age, in the midst of society; he was moreover a religious man, chiefly by virtue of his education among the Moravians. Was he by natural talent a thinker, and did he find time and opportunity to develope that talent as pro-

fessor in a university: he was also practical man as preacher and minister of church and school affairs. It is not strange, therefore, that with him the ideas of Jesus are not the principal thing, but that he chiefly attends to Jesus' *work*, the founding of the church, whose power and influence on his mind he had moreover experienced among the Moravians. He sees in Jesus' birth a new creative act of God, in Jesus himself a second Adam, the progenitor of a renovated humanity. Although he speaks on his doctrine, yet the doctrine is to him subordinate to the instruction, his *Lehre* to his *Lehrthätigkeit*, and this *Lehrthätigkeit* is to him this, that Jesus himself communicates his divine perfection to others, which communication at the same time, as real aim of his mission, is comprised in his work of founding his society. Not the faith *of Jesus*, but faith *in Jesus*, is therefore the principal thing, for which we must strive.

To combine all: To Renan Jesus is a half-fanatical, half-deceiving revolutionist.

To Strauss he is a virtuous man and clear thinker, who among the many promoters of the ideal of humanity stands on the highest grade perfection, although not without narrowness, faults, and errors.

To Schleiermacher he is a being of a peculiar kind, infallible and sinless by virtue of the divine power belonging to him, and thereby renovator of humanity.

Secondly: If these three scholars take a different view of Jesus' person, no less do they of the *sources* whence our knowledge of Him must be derived.

Renan says that Palestine has become to him a fifth Gospel, which in general completely establishes the credibility of the four which we have. The whole country with its relics of earlier ages, with its climate and soil, with the mode of life of its inhabitants, in one word, all that he found there, has confirmed in him the conviction, that the four Gospels are in the main credible writings, descended to us from the first century. They cannot be of later date, nor composed elsewhere than in Palestine.

These, then, are to him the sources. But yet a miracle is regarded by him as impossible. The miraculous accounts must therefore be explained by accepting a so-called pious fraud.

He moreover uses those sources so arbitrarily, so through one another, without attending to any order of time, that his *Life of Jesus*, which professes to be drawn from them, is purely the work of his fancy. Even Colani, in many respects of kindred spirit with Renan, testifies in the name of science, history, and criticism, that no discussion is possible in reference to so arbitrary a product of fancy.

Discussion is indeed possible with Strauss: with him all is reasoning. He denies that the Gospels are credible. Every thing swarmed in that age with fables and inventions. Fancy has without design as of itself embellished history. What we have therefore in the Gospels, is not history of Jesus, but representation of that history, as it had become among the primitive Christians seventy or a hundred years after Jesus Christ. The proper ground for this view of the Gospels is the hypothesis: miracles are impossible.

Schleiermacher thinks that the first three Gospels are later reproductions of an older source, but that they are nevertheless in the principal matter true. For this is confirmed by John, who passes with Schleiermacher for an eye-witness. As much as possible he endeavours to comprehend them, but often he cannot, and he relinquishes the attempt. But this does not prevent him from accepting them as true, since he regards miracles not only as possible but as natural. Just as the first man had a supernatural origin, so also the first born of the new creation. And is He himself the miracle of miracles, then are the miracles, the miraculous acts of Him and facts with Him, inseparable from Him, and with Him natural. The sum is: With Renan disregard of criticism prevails; Strauss uses criticism, but as an auxiliary to establish his philosophical hypothesis; Schleiermacher also avails himself of criticism, but in order to understand as far as possible the history of Jesus and to purify the accounts we have of it.

We make now only these two observations, and in this order, because the second depends on the first. Apparently, indeed, is their opinion of the sources the principal matter; but it is in reality governed by their representation of Jesus' person. But now one question more: Whence that difference between their views of the sources and of Jesus himself?

It proceeds from the different personality of the writers. No one views history without previously adopting and adhering to presuppositions; and these are regulated by what a man is. Renan is admirer of the French Revolution, Strauss a Hegelian philosopher, Schleiermacher pupil of the United Brethren. Hence great difference. And so will by all, and also by us, as well the person of Jesus, as the sources whence we derive our knowledge of Him, be differently viewed, in proportion as we ourselves are differently educated and differently disposed persons; whence among other things it follows, that we have not yet done with the history of Jesus, and that the right view of it depends on much besides our learning.

The difference between Renan, Strauss, and Schleiermacher, has a deep soil. The vivacious Frenchman comprehends that *life* has gone out from Jesus, but superficial he sees life only with Jesus in so far as a popular movement was occasioned by him, so as to give rise to adherence and opposition. The German philosopher has no conception of life, only of *idea;* he does not suspect that there is necessity in the mind for deliverance from the guilt and dominion of sin, and that this necessity demands satisfaction by deed and work, whilst the reflection upon and comprehension of it come afterward. That necessity was deeply engraven on Schleiermacher's mind, and was therefore distinctly before his spirit. He comprehended that *life* had gone out from Jesus, a moral, religious life, a renovation of humanity. Briefly: Renan is admirer of revolution, Strauss is thinker, Schleiermacher is man of conscience, formed by his education among the Moravians: Schleiermacher is at the same time believing Christian. Herein he stands opposite to both the others, that he believed in Jesus as the Christ. And this had great influence on his *Life of Jesus;* for the manner in which we view the life of Jesus depends on the relation of our mind to his person. The greater or less vital communion with the Lord determines also in great measure our mode of viewing the person, work, and fate of Jesus.

It is alleged in opposition to these remarks on Jesus, that, if the character of Jesus according to Renan be half-fanatic, half-deceiver, this would make such a strange whole of fanaticism, deceit or error, that no place would remain in it for the truth.

In this case Renan could not have so much respect for Jesus, as he in reality manifests.

Against this it may be said, that the representation of Jesus by Renan is indeed an absurdity, and so is not the true, but still it is Renan's; and we may not make Renan speak differently from what he has himself spoken. He is absurd; of this we may not deprive him. The sentence passed by Colani on him, as cited above, is therefore just.

Is respect for Jesus irreconcilable therewith, be it so; this shows indeed the absurdity and falsity of Renan's views, but not that our representation of those views is unjust or untrue. There are other men who firmly embrace absurdities, and yet have respect for characters that do not deserve it. But it is not asserted that Renan perceives nothing good or true in Jesus: this he does continually: it is only asserted, that Jesus is with him on the whole a good-natured, often sublime fanatic, and at the same time a deceiver, who adopts the maxim, that the world will and so also must be deceived. This is most clearly to be seen in Renan's representation of the raising of Lazarus.

It cannot be conceded by some, that there is a real and characteristic difference between the historical criticism of Strauss and Schleiermacher. Does the former employ criticism to become as accurately as possible acquainted with the history of Jesus, is not that, it is asked, also the case with the other? Is there a difference in their criticism in kind, or only in degree? Is Strauss under the influence of a philosophical view of the world, Schleiermacher is equally so. Strauss does indeed deny the supernatural, but though Schleiermacher speaks of supernatural, yet whenever he attempts to explain it, the supernatural becomes natural. Is Strauss Hegelian, of Schleiermacher it may be said, he is Spinozist.

We cannot admit that the historical criticism of Strauss and Schleiermacher is homogeneous. Strauss does indeed speak now with more copiousness and esteem of Jesus' person than he did thirty years ago; then all was analysis and destruction, now there is also synthesis and upbuilding. He acknowledges in Jesus a noble personality, and places Jesus in so far even above a Paul, Augustine, and Luther, that there was not with

Him as with these a conflict, nor was a violent overturning of the spiritual life necessary. But yet Strauss says, expressly, that Jesus is not an Only One, and adopts Renan's view, that He is only a leader in religion, as Socrates and Aristotle were in philosophy and science. And Strauss never will, and never can, concede that Jesus is an Only One, as long as he holds that such an exception could not have been made in the domain of religion, since nothing similar is found in any other domain. Schleiermacher on the contrary says, at the close of his *Leben Jesu*, as sum of all, that if we will not concede that Jesus is an Only person of a wholly peculiar sort, it is impossible to write a history of Jesus, as then from natural causes must arbitrarily and uncritically be explained, what is therefrom never to be explained. Strauss and Schleiermacher stand diametrically opposed to each other in the main thing on which all depends. Therefore Strauss says himself, that they to whom the supernatural is intolerable, who cannot acknowledge Jesus as God-man, have in historical criticism an auxiliary to justify their views. Does criticism thus serve Schleiermacher, to become as far as possible acquainted with the person of Jesus as history exhibits Him, it serves Strauss to support his philosophical hypotheses and to annihilate Jesus' personality, as it is presented in the Gospels. And does Schleiermacher desire by his criticism to form unprejudiced preachers of the gospel for the upbuilding of the church: Strauss desires by his, to expel the priests from the church and therewith let the church itself fall to pieces.

The propriety is also questioned of bringing purely historico-critical questions into connection with the state of one's mind: criticism and heart have, it is thought, nothing to do with each other.

This cannot be admitted. Man is one whole; has his intellect influence on his heart, no less has the state of his heart on the views of his intellect. Of the woman Schiller says:

> Des Weibes Urtheil ist seine Liebe. Wo es nicht liebt,
> Hat schon gerichtet das Weib.

But this holds, though most strongly, not only of the woman. Predilection or antipathy has also on the man great influence

and excites in him prejudices, fits or unfits him to comprehend men and things, and to judge of them according to truth. To both Renan and Strauss applies, what Colani and a very liberal English writer say of Renan in relation to Jesus more or less in these words: "Jesus was a man of sublime ideas and plans, so that he desired to reform the world; but this is in the eyes of Renan, who is contented with the present, the greatest error of his life. Renan has style and taste; but these do not preserve him from commonplaceness in the contemplation of the moral world. He possesses imagination to soar to a higher world; but his faith sets its foot on the ground beneath us, and acknowledges no power save that of the blended motives which govern a weak and self-deceiving humanity."

Truly, Renan and Strauss belong to another world than Jesus. They are not homogeneous with him: how should they be able to understand him? Schleiermacher stands indeed far beneath his Master, but is his pupil, sitting at his feet, desiring to imbibe and actually imbibing his spirit.

Renan and Strauss can absolutely not understand the Lord, Schleiermacher can in some measure.

SHORT NOTICES.

Life of Robert Owen. Philadelphia: Ashmead & Evans, No. 724 Chestnut street. 1866. Pp. 254.

Robert Owen was a remarkable man. His father having lost his property in a lawsuit, the son had in early life to contend with all the disadvantages of poverty, which by his talents and energy he soon overcame. It is said that at three years of age he read Rapin's History of England; when seven years old he was usher in a school; before thirteen he was clerk in a large mercantile establishment; and before he came of age "he was put in sole charge of the first mill for the manufacture of fine cotton yarn that was ever built." Here he had five hundred operatives under him, whose labours he had to direct; he was called to superintend the working of complicated machinery of which at first he knew little about, to buy the raw material, manufacture it into yarn, secure a market for it, keep the accounts, and pay the hands. All this he did and made the business a success. After a few years, having occasion to visit Scotland, he formed the acquaintance of a wealthy merchant and manufacturer, Mr. Dale, (whose daughter he subsequently married,) and contracted with him for the purchase of his mills at New Lanark for three hundred thousand dollars. He soon found himself here with full control of a large establishment, which afforded a field for carrying out his peculiar view of the method of reforming and elevating the operative classes. In a business point of view the enterprise was eminently successful. Mr. Owen evinced not only great sagacity, energy, and skill, in all these operations, but showed that he had the power of securing the respect and affection of all classes of men. From an early period he formed the purpose of reforming society. For the work of a reformer he possessed great advantages. He had great talents, great industry, great versatility, indomitable courage and perseverance, and great kindness and generosity. He was moreover sure of success. Regarding himself as infallible in judgment, believing that he, and he only, progressed to the true theory of society, that to him had been assigned the mission of banishing ignorance, vice, and misery from the world,

he was not to be daunted by any amount of opposition, nor by any number of failures. He remained at eighty-seven as confident in himself and in his theories, as he was in the days of his youth. All opposition to his measures or dissent from his principles was attributed to ignorance, malice, or bigotry. He came at last almost to look upon mankind, as has been said of another man, as little more than a greater anti-Owen society. His grand difficulty was that he attempted to solve a problem leaving out its two principal factors. He ignored the depravity of man, and the providence and grace of God. Before he had entered on his teens he had arrived at the conclusion, after, as he supposed, thorough investigation, that all religions are false. To this conclusion he adhered through life. His doctrine was that human character is formed by circumstances. A man is what he is simply because of his surroundings. He can infallibly be made good or bad by changing the external circumstances of his being. So that there are no good or bad men, but only good or bad cultivators. No man is responsible for his character or conduct. For conduct is determined by character, and character depends as absolutely on circumstances as health on climate and diet. To secure favourable circumstances, he proposed to form into societies, either on the coöperative or communistic principle. All preferences for one's own interest, offspring, or country, were to be renounced. Communities were to be formed, occupying each its own district, having the products of labour in common, all eating together as one family, all dressing alike, and the children all educated alike. Any man, however sceptical as to religion, could foresee that all such schemes were as preposterous as an attempt to make trees and flowers of the same size and colour. Of course Owen's schemes failed. During the later period of his life he became a spiritualist, affording another illustration of the truth that our only choice is between religion and superstition. If we reject the one, we embrace the other. The volume before us is elegantly printed. It is written by a Christian, who, while he gives the subject of the memoir full credit for all his excellencies, and for all the good he incidentally accomplished, does not fail to exhibit his gross errors of principle, and mistakes in practice. The work is instructive and interesting.

Meditations in Advent, on Creation, and on Providence. By Henry Alford, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. Alexander Strahan, Publisher, 148 Strand, London; and 178 Grand street, New York. 1865. Pp. 240.

Dean Alford is best known in this country as the author of a critical commentary on the New Testament, a work evincing

ripe scholarship. He is also a poet, and the writer of a popular book of travels, and of other works in general literature. The title of the present volume will probably create a misapprehension of its character. By "meditations," when written, we generally mean the expression of devout feelings awakened by religious truth. Dean Alford uses the word in its wider sense, for thoughts, or studies. He proposes to exhibit the great doctrines of the Advent, Creation, and Providence, free from the technicalities of theology. Nevertheless the work is didactic. It is addressed more immediately to the intelligence than to the feelings. As a commentator Dr. Alford is somewhat latitudinarian, he often expresses himself in ways which cannot be reconciled with any very strict views of the inspiration of the Scriptures. In this volume he seems to receive the most difficult doctrines of revelation with a submissive faith. Whatever he may be as a theologian, as an instructor of the people he is an Augustinian. He says things which would satisfy the most orthodox Calvinist. This, good men, who speak out of their own experience, and from the conviction derived immediately from the Bible, can hardly avoid doing. The great difficulties connected with the doctrine of Providence, the foreknowledge and foreordination of God, and his absolute control over all events, whether great or small, whether necessary or free, are stated and admitted. Both classes of truth, those concerning the government and sovereignty of God, and the free agency and responsibility of man, are fully recognized. Their reconciliation is not attempted, and is pronounced impossible for man with his limited powers in the present state of his existence. Yet the denial of either, it is shown, works fatal evil. To the intelligent Christian this will prove a useful book. To the sceptic or the philosopher it will not present such great attractions.

Hope for the Hopeless. An Autobiography of John Vine Hall, author of "The Sinner's Friend." Edited by Rev. Newman Hall, LL.B. of Surrey Chapel, London. Abridged with the author's consent. American Tract Society. Pp. 264.

In his youth Mr. Hall was a gay, worldly man, and became addicted to intemperance. Redeemed from this degradation, after many struggles and much suffering, he became an eminent Christian and a zealous advocate of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks. His tract, or little book, has had an extraordinary circulation, over one million five hundred thousand copies of it having been distributed.

Miscellanies from the Writings of Edward Irving. Alexander Strahan & Co., Publishers, 148 Strand, London, and 178 Grand street, New York. 1865. Pp. 487.

Edward Irving was a man of so much genius and power, and the promise of his early life was so encouraging, that the friends of religion in Great Britain have not yet ceased to regret that he should have been turned aside from the paths of usefulness into those of innovation. Apart from his eccentricities and errors, there is much profound thought, and much of devout sentiment to be found in his writings. The extracts contained in this volume are arranged under the heads, Ethical, Doctrinal, Practical, &c. In the second of these classes are brought to light most of the author's peculiar views on the Trinity, Incarnation, Person and work of Christ, &c. Besides the inherent value of much that is embraced in this collection, it has the advantage of presenting in few words and under distinct heads, the opinions of a man whose influence is still felt in England and America.

The Elements of Moral Science. By Francis Wayland, D. D., LL.D., late President of Brown University, and Professor of Moral Philosophy. Revised and Improved Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: J. S. Blanchard & Co. 1865. Pp. 396.

The first edition of this popular work was published in 1835. Its final revision and correction was one of the last efforts of its lamented author. Dr. Wayland as a fluent and pleasing writer, as a sound theologian, and teacher of a system of morals in all its essential elements in accordance with the truth, has a reputation so extensive and so well established, that this improved edition of the work by which he is most favourably known needs no further recommendation to the public.

A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. By John William Draper, M. D., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York. Second Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1864.

Thoughts on the Future Civil Policy of America. By John William Draper, M. D., LL.D., Professor, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1865.

Professor Draper has long been known, not only as an eminent chemist and physiologist, but generally as a physicist, having a somewhat encyclopediac view of the whole field of physical science. The titles of his later works show that he is stretching, beyond this great domain, into the realms of the non-physical, the phenomena of our intellectual and moral nature. His main scope in these works, however, is to survey all subjects of the latter class from the stand-point of physical science, and

according to its methods and laws. His "History of the Intellectual Development of Europe" is really a history of the progress of scientific discovery, with certain inferences and applications, designed to support his own theories in regard to psychology, ethics, religion, sociology. As these constitute the peculiarities, so they constitute the debateable element, in these treatises. To these we will shortly recur.

Meanwhile, we observe that so far as these books consist of delineations of the progress of science, they evince great power. They show a large knowledge of scientific discovery in its various departments, and a remarkable faculty for vivid and graphic delineation. His style is always fresh and animated, seldom feeble or common-place. He rarely writes long on any subject, without waxing eloquent. So far as the annals and achievements of physical science are concerned, the reader will find much in these, and in all the author's works, to instruct and entertain. But it is not the mere annals of science that constitute the moment of these books. It is his philosophy of these facts; his reasonings and deductions from them in reference to some of the great problems of society, of morals, and religion, pertaining to God, the soul, immortality. We now ask attention to the author's distinctive positions on these subjects. We will premise, however, that, in various places, he "asserts a personal God," and "Sovereign Constructor of the Universe;" how far consistently with other deliverances, we will not now determine. The subjects on which he gives utterances that demand notice are,

I. The Eternity and Indestructibility of Matter and Force.

"Material particles are thus the vehicles of force. They undergo no destruction. Chemically speaking, they are eternal. And so, likewise, force never deteriorates or becomes lessened. It may assume new phases, but it is always intrinsically unimpaired. The sum total of matter in the universe is invariable; so likewise is the sum total of force." (*History of Europe*, pp. 601—2.) "Extensive and imposing as is the structure of chemistry, it is very far from its completion. . . . . *It has, however, disposed of the idea of the destruction and creation of matter.* It accepts without hesitation the doctrine of the imperishability of substance." (*Id.* p. 602). It is only an inference from all this, to say of the past history of our earth, "its moments look as if they were eternities," and that, "with the abandonment of the geocentric theory, and of the doctrine of the human destiny of the universe, have vanished the unworthy

hypotheses of the recent date of creation and approaching end of all things." In their stead are substituted more noble ideas. The multiplicity of worlds in infinite space leads to the conception of a succession of worlds in infinite time. This existing universe, with all its splendours, had a beginning, and will have an end; it had its predecessors, and will have its successors; but its march through all its transformations is under the control of laws as unchangeable as destiny." (*Id.* pp. 572—3.)

We think that these passages teach unambiguously that matter is uncreated, indestructible, and eternal. It, indeed, undergoes transmutations. Worlds may and must disappear and be transformed into other worlds. But this is by "laws as unchangeable as destiny," and, of course, uncontrollable by the will of God. If this does not furnish us the primordial elements of Fatalism and Materialism, what can? But this will appear still further, as we come to other points, of which the next is:

II. Psychology and Metaphysics.

Says Dr. Draper: "So far from philosophy being a forbidden domain to the physiologist, it may be asserted that the time has now come when no one is entitled to express an opinion in philosophy except he has first studied physiology. It has hitherto been to the detriment of truth that these processes of positive investigation have been repudiated. If from the construction of the human brain we may demonstrate the existence of a soul, is not that a gain? for there are many who are open to arguments of this class, on whom speculative reasoning or a mere dictum fall without any weight. Why should we cast aside the solid facts presented to us by material objects? In his communications throughout the universe with us, God ever materializes. He equally speaks to us through the thousand graceful organic forms scattered in profusion over the surface of the earth, and through the motions and appearances presented by the celestial orbs. Our noblest and clearest conceptions of his attributes have been obtained from these material things. I am persuaded that the only possible route to truth in mental philosophy is through the nervous mechanism. The experience of 2500 years, and the writings of the great metaphysical intellects attest, with a melancholy emphasis, the vanity of all other means.

"Whatever may be said by speculative philosophers to the contrary, the advancement of metaphysics is through the study of physiology. They have given us imposing doctrines of the nature and attributes of the mind in absolute ignorance of its material substratum. . . . In voluntarily isolating themselves

from every solid fact which might serve to be a landmark to them, they may truly be said to have sailed upon a shoreless sea from which the fog never lifts. The only fact which they teach with certainty, is that they know nothing with certainty. . . . *What is not founded on a material substratum, is necessarily a castle in the air.*" (*Id.* pp. 579—80.)

Is then the truth that God is a pure spirit "without body, parts, or passions," a "castle in the air"? And is his nature rooted in "a material substratum"? Are our "noblest and clearest conceptions of his attributes," of holiness, justice, wisdom, truth, mercy, and love, "obtained from material things, or from the phenomena of our own souls, and the revelations of his word? But then these souls, it is insisted, are founded on a "material substratum." Otherwise they are "castles in the air." It is of no use to study them except "through the study of physiology." If we would inspect the mind, we must inspect the brain. "That wonderful organ is the basis of all their (psychologist's) speculations." So reasons our author. But it would be hard to ignore and deny more completely the most rudimental facts in mental philosophy. For how are these, or any facts pertaining to the mind, known? By the examination of brain, nerves, skull, or by any external observation whatever? Never. Not the first fact or truth regarding the mind ever was or ever can be so discovered. Truths in mental science can only be learned by the study of consciousness, for they are phenomena of consciousness, and can only be learned therefrom. How dare this author tell us that nothing certain is known in metaphysics but its own uncertainty? Does not every page he writes imply, that we are certain that we know, think, reason, feel, desire, and will? And how do we know this? By an examination of the brain, or of consciousness? This attempt to materialize the mind, by identifying it with its material organs, and to degrade the study of mind into a mere branch of anatomy and physiology, needs only to be stated to be refuted. Out upon such bold and unblushing materialism! A like spirit is manifested again,

III. In the Denial of Supernatural Agency.

"It might be consistent with the weakness and ignorance of man to be reduced to the necessity of personal intervention for the accomplishment of his plans, but would not that be the very result of such ignorance? Does not absolute knowledge actually imply procedure by preconceived and unvarying law? Is not momentary intervention altogether derogatory to the thorough and absolute sovereignty of God? The astronomical

calculation of events, as well as the prediction of those to come, is essentially founded on the principle, that there was not in the times under consideration, and that there will never be in future, any exercise of an arbitrary or over-riding will. The corner-stone of astrónomy is this, that the solar system—nay, the universe, is ruled by necessity. . . . A system which works of itself without need of intermeddling." (*Id.* p. 557.)

This makes the universe wholly independent of the sustentation, guidance, and control of Him, who is not only the Creator, but the Upholder and Disposer of all things; who upholds all things by the word of His Power; and does all things according to the counsel of His own will: who can create and destroy at pleasure: who can stop the sun in its course, seal the skies that they pour down no rain for years; or, anon, overflow the world with water, or make the heavens to pass away with a great noise, and the elements to melt with fervent heat, and the earth and all that is therein to be burned up: who has done, and will do, these and other things the like, when requisite for the completion of the great plans of his wisdom and grace. The laws of nature are doubtless uniform, in ordinary circumstances. But to hold that he may not arrest, suspend, or counteract them, at his sovereign pleasure, or that they can operate independently of him, is simply a dogma of infidelity and atheism. It is just now the fashionable form of scientific scepticism. But it is among the tokens of the inspiration of the Scriptures, that they so clearly predict and reprobate it. They tell us of the scoffers who shall come in the last days and ask, "where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation." (2 Peter iii. 3, 4.) What is this but that unchangeableness of nature's law, claimed by modern scepticism, which rules out all supernatural intervention, whether of miracle or grace?

It is in keeping with this, that Dr. Draper should assure us that "the process of attaining correct views of nature has been marked by a continual decline of the mysterious and supernatural," and that "meteorology, less advanced than many of the other sciences, has not freed itself completely from the supernatural. . . . Men have not yet clearly learned that the course of nature will never be changed at their entreaty; they do not understand that their business is, by exercising the reason that has been given them, to attain foreknowledge of coming events, and arrange their affairs accordingly." (*Thoughts on the Future, &c.*, pp. 213—16, 17.) And in the other volume (p. 538), speaking of man as under the influence of various

illusions and dreams, he asks if it is "surprising, that under such influences, he becomes superstitious?" . . . "Open to such influences himself. Why should he not believe in the efficacy of prayer?" Do we need more evidence of the impious character of this system?

4. It is of a piece with the foregoing, that we should find the development and "transmutation of species," by the mere force of natural causes, advocated, thus eliminating all divine creative agency in the production of new species, (*Hist., &c.*, p. 566, *et seq.*) "Man is the last term of an innumerable series of organisms, which, under the denomination of law, has, in the lapse of time, been evolving." (*Id.* p. 590.) On this we have no room to enlarge.

5. And we have barely time to note the great practical consequence to which all his array of facts and arguments is made tributary. It is that the attempt to elevate man by improving his moral and religious character is a failure, and must be abandoned. It must give way to intellectual development as the true and only regenerator of the race. He tells us "the aim of nature is not at moral, but intellectual development." (*Id.* p. 591.) "The moral method fails to yield the results popularly imputed to it." (*Thoughts, &c.*, p. 282.) "The improvement of society can only be accomplished through the intellect. The moral is, in its very nature, stationary." (*Id.* p. 291.) But we must stop. The sceptical and destructive principles advocated have been made sufficiently and painfully evident. We deeply deplore, while we protest and stand amazed at the one-sided perversion of the sublime truths which Dr. Draper so eloquently expounds, and yet so blindly hurls against those great principles of morality and religion which are sublimer still; which ennoble and purify our higher nature; with which man becomes allied to angels, a child and heir of God; without which he is only highest among the brutes that perish. We by no means undervalue scientific discovery, with its vast train of inventions for the relief and comfort of mankind. We thank God for all the achievements of steam and electricity, in abridging time, and distance, and toil. But we tell the whole tribe of positivists, and those who are more or less their imitators or echoes, that there is more power to regenerate and uplift our race, in the simple words of the Son of God, "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest," than in all the discoveries of science and philosophy which ignore them. We confess, that simply as a manifestation of intellectual power, we have no respect for this one-eyed insight. What is there in the knowledge of the

natural to disprove the supernatural? Nothing. "Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should raise the dead?" Why? And echo answers, why? To recite, as Professor Draper and other writers of this school do, the exaggerations, corruptions, and superstitions that have obtained credence, through the misleading and perversion of man's moral and religious nature, for the purpose of bringing all belief in religion and supernatural agencies into discredit, is just about as reasonable as to parade the scientific vagaries, the geocentric theories, the elixirs, philosopher stones, and universal solvents of the old alchemists, for the purpose of disparaging science. Both processes are alike unworthy of profound and comprehensive thinkers.

Proceedings and Addresses at the Celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the Cliosophic Society of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, New Jersey, June 27th, 1865. Princeton: William W. Smith. 1865. Pp. 188. Price, $1.00.

The contents of this publication are, 1. History of the Cliosophic Society from 1765 to 1865, prepared for and read at the Centennial Celebration, June 27th, 1865, by Professor G. Musgrave Giger, D. D. 2. Memoir of the Hon. William Paterson, LL.D., one of the founders of the Society, by William Paterson, Esq., of Perth Amboy, N. J. 3. Oration before the Cliosophic Society at the Centennial Celebration, by Rev. Edward N. Kirk, D. D. 4. Arrangements for the Centennial Celebration, and Proceedings at the Collation, including speeches by Chancellors Green and Halsted, Hon. William C. Alexander, Professor Henry, Drs. Edwards, Atwater, Macdonald, Kirk, Stephen Alexander, Hon. Robert McKnight, and A. O. Zabriskie, LL.D. These contents of this volume sufficiently vouch for their interest and value. The extended biographical sketches and historical facts in Dr. Giger's narrative will preserve from oblivion much that was nearly lost, while they give a deserved tribute to some of the most illustrious names on the roll of Nassau Hall, and of the country. Dr. Kirk's address is rich in judicious and earnest counsels, which it would be of the highest benefit to the students of our country to read and heed.

The utility of the great literary societies of our colleges in promoting rhetorical culture and familiarity with the methods of deliberative bodies is understood by all acquainted with them. And it is every way salutary to connect with important dates or events in their history those great commemorative festivals, in which not only their own members, but the lovers of high education and elegant letters delight to participate.

This volume has at once a melancholy and pleasing interest as being the last labour of the late Dr. Giger. His historical narrative forms the larger part of it. The delivery of it at the Centennial Celebration was his last public effort. The preparation and superintendence of its publication was the last work of his life. And it was ready for delivery on the day of his death. He fell in his prime. His devotion to the Society and the College, which mourn his loss, was ardent and enthusiastic. No memento of him could be more suitable than this contribution to the history of both.

Address on the Duty of Congregationalism to Itself, at the meeting of the Massachusetts General Conference. By Professor Egbert C. Smyth, of Andover.

The recent formation of this General Conference of Congregationalists in Massachusetts is one of the many outgrowths of the present tendencies in that denomination towards a fuller realization of the unity of the church and the communion of saints. The address of Professor Smyth before this body is also a token for good in the same direction. He strenuously maintains a type of Congregationalism which repudiates Independency—which not only recognizes the duty of fellowship, but provides "appropriate agencies and organs of fellowship," whereby, "whenever common interests of ecclesiastical order are involved," not "mere advice," but "a decision may be obtained." He says:

"These two features of Congregationalism—its recognition of the obligation of fellowship on the part of the churches of Christ—and its provision, as an integral part of the system, of the agencies requisite to *decide* questions of fellowship, and to enable the churches to coöperate in Christian labour, are the most marked signs which distinguish it from Independency."

And we will add, they comprise the more important principles which underlie Presbyterianism, the difference between it and the Congregationalism of Professor Smyth lying more in the kind of "agencies" or "organs" provided for carrying out these principles than the principles themselves. As to the comparative merits of these two kinds of organs, we do not deem it necessary to discuss them here. Professor Smyth well says: "There are various reasons which make it important that Congregationalists should emphasize, at the present time, the chief peculiarity of their system of polity." There is a tone of candour, good sense, and charity about this address which are its own best commendation; while they are a fit rebuke to that

censorious denunciation whereby some of the more radical advocates of Congregationalism, whose zeal outruns their discretion, have lately attempted to put a stigma upon such of their brethren as have seen fit to enter the Presbyterian church, or its institutions of learning and ministerial education. The following passage is quite in point, and needs no comment:

"It is an impossibility that any ecclesiastical system can obtain here an ascendancy at all commensurate with our nation's greatness, in which the centrifugal forces are stronger than the centripetal. Resolve Congregationalism into Independency; teach that the latter is substantially the same with the former; and Episcopalianism, or Presbyterianism, or some system which can embrace the ideas of unity and fellowship in unity, will have supreme sway, or else there will be a chaos.

"We hear much of severe censure bestowed upon Congregationalists, New England men, who are serving as teachers and pastors in the Presbyterian denomination. The increase and power of the latter system is ascribed, in no small measure, to the alleged infidelity of Congregationalists to their principles. Let all 'faded Yankees' be scourged as they deserve. I have no apology to offer for men who are ashamed of New England. But I deem it a perilous method of reasoning, to affirm that a denomination, which is nobly serving Christ in this land, and whose history has been one of honourable and successful evangelical labour, has been built up by accessions of men unfaithful to principle. Men of common sense do not accept railing accusations, even when designed to promote a good cause. No. Presbyterianism has been served because of higher motives than any known to men who can desert a principle. I will not undertake to designate these motives. Yet there is one noteworthy instance, so far removed in the past that I may allude to it without misapprehension. 'I have long been perfectly out of conceit,' once wrote the man whom of all others our New England churches most delight to honour, the elder Edwards—'I have long been perfectly out of conceit of our unsettled, *independent*, confused way of church government.' We may be sure of this, that the more that Congregationalism is pressed out of its true line of movement, the more it is assimilated to an independency in which the centre and circumference are one—the more will men be out of conceit with it."

We hail this address as one token of promise that the chief rivalry between Congregationalists and Presbyterians in the future will be, as to how they can most "provoke one another to love and good works."

Dissertations and Discussions, Political, Philosophical, and Historical. By John Stuart Mill. In Three Volumes. Boston: William V. Spencer. 1864.

This is a collection of the author's publications in periodicals, "selected from a much greater number, and includes all his miscellaneous productions which he deems it in any way desirable to preserve." Our readers will gather from our repeated notices of his books, that we deem him a lucid and profound writer, who almost invariably sheds light on whatever subjects he touches, except at their points of contact with morals and religion, when he only becomes *lux a non lucendo*. With a strong taint of Positivism, he has more breadth than most writers of that school. Still, he betrays their antichristian virus. On his own plane, of the earthly, material, and temporal, few men see farther or more clearly. In regard to the spiritual, heavenly, and divine, he wants the telescope of Faith, and is as much at fault as the astronomer without his glass. It behooves all this increasing swarm of materializing writers to remember Coleridge's remark, that even charts of earth cannot be scientifically constructed without celestial observations.

Effie Morrison: or the Family of Redbraes. A Narrative of Truth. By the author of "Allan Cameron," "Ilverton Rectory," "Evelyn Percival," &c.

A Father's Letters to his Daughter. By Robert A. West, A. M.

Our Sympathizing High-Priest: Meditations on the Daily Sorrows of our Saviour. By A. L. O. E.

Lullabies, Ditties, and Poetic Tales for Children.

The foregoing are recent publications of the American Tract Society, furnishing excellent reading for the young, and material for Sabbath-school libraries.

Life and Character of J. H. Van Der Palm, D. D., Professor of Oriental Languages and Antiquities; also of Sacred Poetry and Eloquence in the University of Leyden. Sketched by Nicolas Beets, D. D. Also ten of his Sermons. Translated from the Dutch by J. P. Westervelt. New York: Hurd & Houghton.

This volume is one of the beautiful productions of the Riverside press. It is gratifying to every lover of books to observe the improvement in typography which has taken place in our country of late years, and to which the tasteful workmanship of Houghton & Company have contributed so much.

Nor is the substance of the volume unworthy of the attire in which it appears. The literary and Christian world owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Westervelt for opening to them the gates of Dutch literature, so long unaccountably shut to all except the

few who are conversant with the Dutch language. A literature so rich in the products of learning, of eloquence, and of piety, accumulated by the unceasing labour of more than two hundred years, ought not to have been sealed so long from the English-speaking public, with which its ethnic and religious affinities are so near and congenial. It is somewhat remarkable that while the Dutch church occupies a place among the most intelligent bodies in our land, the works of the greatest preacher of Holland are still strangers to the English tongue, and his very name strange to our ears.

Although the volume before us gives only a few of his sermons—specimens from the great treasury of his works—we welcome it as the first nugget from a newly-opened vein of precious ore.

The life of Van Der Palm, which occupies about half the volume, is a valuable piece of literary biography, and appropriate in its place, introducing its illustrious subject to the reader.

The style of the translation is clear, unambitious, and graceful. We sincerely hope that Mr. Westervelt may meet with such favour in this effort as to encourage him to come before the public again with more selections from the same quarter.

The Vicarious Sacrifice: Grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

This book has reached us just as our last sheets go to the press. We have, therefore, been able to examine only an occasional chapter of it. We hope after a more thorough examination, to present a full review of it in another number. Meanwhile, what we have seen already, is sufficient to call for a solemn protest against the leading principles of the work.

Some dozen years ago, Dr. Bushnell shocked the Christian world by publications teaching, in reference to the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, that, if God could accept the sufferings of innocence in place of the sufferings of guilt, it would involve in Him "the loss or confusion of all moral distinctions," and amount to "the simplest form of absurdity;" while yet it was necessary for the soul to present Christ's work to itself under the altar-form of being an objective sacrifice and righteousness for us, in order to work itself in devotional exercises and Christian culture. In other words, the soul must make use of a conception of God in Christ, which it knows to be an absurdity and an abomination, in order to promote pious affection and holy living. So we were brought to the *ne plus ultra* of pious frauds, the furtherance of pious feeling by an im-

posture; and the central, life-giving truth of our religion was analyzed into a contradiction and a sham. The Christian church stood aghast at such a horrible presentation of Christ and Him crucified; and have ever since been perplexed to determine whether its author's escape from ecclesiastical censure was due to the inherent impotence of the Congregational polity to purge out heresy, or to a predominant sympathy with it among the ministers of Connecticut.

We had hoped that the lapse of time, the cessation of controversy and ecclesiastical agitation on the subject, the teachings of manifold experience, along with thorough study, had delivered Dr. Bushnell from his bondage to these monstrous dogmas. It was with such hope, strengthened by its title, that we hailed the appearance of this new treatise—the calmly elaborated expression of his ripened convictions—a hope which the bare survey of the table of contents is quite enough to extinguish.

The title suggested, 1. That he was about to maintain the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. 2. That the necessity for it, in order to the forgiveness of sinners, is grounded in the moral perfections, the justice and holiness of God, and so "in principles of universal obligation." But no. The "vicarious sacrifice" of Christ, in the room of sinners, as that has been ever understood by Christians, and their adversaries as well, is utterly denied and scouted in this volume. The "vicarious sacrifice" admitted and defended by Dr. Bushnell, is of the same kind as love in all good beings bears for its objects; and is common alike to God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to holy angels, and redeemed men. So "vicarious sacrifice is grounded in principles of universal obligation," as all love, and its appropriate sacrifices for its objects, are of universal obligation!

The Holy Spirit, says Dr. Bushnell, "works in love as Christ did, and suffers all the incidents of love. . . . Taking men upon him to bear them and their sins, precisely as Christ himself did in his sacrifice." (P. 74.) He had previously affirmed the same of God the Father. He proceeds to assert the same of the good angels, and then tells us, "In what is called his vicarious sacrifice, Christ, as we have seen, simply fulfils what belongs universally to love, doing neither more nor less than what the common standard of holiness and right requires. . . . Vicarious sacrifice then will not be a point where he is distinguished from his followers, but the very life to which he restores them, in restoring them to love. What we call his redemption of mankind must bring them to the common standard. Executed by vicarious sacrifice in himself, it must be issued in vicarious

sacrifice in them. . . . There can be no greater mistake, in this view, than to imagine that Christ has the matter of vicarious sacrifice wholly to himself, because he suffers officially, or as having undertaken it for his office to supply so much suffering. He suffered simply what was incidental to his love, and the works to which his love prompted, just as any missionary suffers what belongs to the work of love he is in. It was vicarious suffering in no way peculiar to him, save in degree." Pp. 105—7.

Yet, in the closing chapter, he insists on the necessity of the altar-form in order to culture the soul in piety. "Oppressed with guilt, we should turn ourselves joyfully to Christ as the propitiation for our sins, Christ who hath borne the curse for us, Christ who knew no sin, made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (P. 537.) And yet, as in his previous works, he inveighs against the doctrine of the direct substitution of Christ's sufferings for the sinner's punishment by all manner of special pleading, caricature, and invective, as revolting to all reason and refined moral sensibility. His doctrine of atonement is sheer, bald Socinianism.

And, indeed, he too often outrages our most sacred feelings by his flippant and contemptuous caricatures of truths dear to the whole church. He assures us, "God himself is not any better than he ought to be." The doctrine that the Holy Spirit is "sent by a kind of immediate or efficient agency to renew the soul," exhibits its work as done, "much as by some unseen hydrostatic pressure, or some silent gun-shot stroke of Omnipotence." Pp. 87—8.

But we must stop here for the present. Dr. Bushnell in this volume is the Dr. Bushnell of old. Not only in his doctrine, but his traits as a writer. He is master of a quaint, brilliant, and vigorous style. He is quite a poet; much of an orator; an indifferent scholar; a wayward thinker; a theologian only in name. His armour defensive is still mysticism and the disparagement of logic. His offensive weapons are still logic whenever it will avail him, both sound and unsound, and his own distortions of Christian doctrine.

Reminiscences, Historical and Biographical, of Sixty-four years in the Ministry. By Rev. Henry Boehm, Bishop Asbury's Travelling Companion and Executor of his last Will and Testament. Edited by Rev. Joseph B. Wakeley. New York: Published by Carlton & Porter. 1865.

Or otherwise, by the *Methodist Book Concern*, whose initials, M. B. C., are stamped on the cover, and which, for some reason, chooses to publish many, if not all of its works, under the name of Carlton & Porter. The volume before us consists of

the reminiscences of a devout, zealous, and devoted minister, a pioneer of American Methodism, which, in addition to their intrinsic value and interest, shed great light on the origin and growth of the great Methodist body in the United States. Rev. Mr. Boehm is a lineal descendant of the celebrated pietist Jacob Boehm.

Social Influence, or Take care of the Boys. By Zell. Author of "Aunt Betsy's Rule." Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This is a good addition to the excellent "Series for Youth," now in course of publication by our Board. It is especially fitted to make boys realize the importance of being select in their associations.

The History of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. By John Foster Kirk. Two volumes. 8vo. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co.

This is a history of the Prescott stamp, and pertaining to that connection of public events to which Mr. Prescott confined himself. It is not, however, an imitation. The author has a style of his own: and that a free and manly one. If in recording political affairs of the fifteenth century, an historian had much range of choice in respect to the moral character of his principal personages, we should say that Mr. Kirk was unfortunate in his hero. For a less attractive one than Charles is not easily found in eminent place out of his own century. But when a man would present the events in which Charles figured, whom shall he set in the foreground? Shall it be his cousin and rival, Louis XI? Perhaps that would be quite as true to the actual relations of things; but it would exhibit a figure less attractive still—with vices more repulsive than those of Charles, and singularly free from virtues to counterbalance them. Walter Scott did not venture to depict Louis in all his meanness and villany, lest he should violate the probabilities of romance. Charles was headstrong, rapacious, unjust, and gratuitously cruel; but he was, at least, open, valorous, and could not wait for the arts of duplicity.

The brief career of independent Burgundy was connected with an important crisis in the history of Europe. France was passing from the state of bondage to a number of feudal princes into the hands of one irresponsible monarch; a process accelerated by her disasters in war with England, which, by breaking down the feudal leaders, opened the way for the reviving monarchy to gather their honours, authorities, and lands, into itself.

It was in that process of aggrandizement that the dukes of Burgundy, for a time, vied with, and almost excelled, the princes of the royal line. Theirs was, however, but a brief

history. When King John of France, taken prisoner at Poictiers, was carried to England, his third son Philip accompanied him to share and console his captivity. The grateful father testified his sense of that filial affection by constituting the lands of Burgundy into a dukedom for him, with the rank of first peer of the kingdom. Four dukes successively reigned in that right, from 1364 A. D. until the death of Charles the Bold in 1477, covering a period of over one hundred years.

In the English politics in France the dukes of Burgundy took a leading part. Philip the Good, father of Charles, actually governed France for many years. It was also the heir of Burgundy who commanded the army sent out to the East to defend Hungary against the Turkish sultan Bajazet, and which met with such discomfiture under the walls of Nicopolis. At home fortune so favoured that ducal house that, when Charles came into possession, it was actually wealthier than any royal family in Christendom. To the lands proper of Burgundy had been added Alsace, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, both north and south; that is, both Holland and Belgium, and many other inferior places, including the most opulent seats of manufactures and commerce. And with less than the wisdom of his father, Charles might have put his own coronet above the crown of Louis. His rapacity and rashness risked all, and lost it with his life. His only heir was a daughter, whom Louis soon plundered of Burgundy. Her son Philip, heir of the Netherlands and what else remained of her hereditary estates, married the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, and became Philip I. of Spain, and father of the Emperor Charles V. And thus the work of Mr. Kirk, when complete, will constitute a valuable preliminary to those of Prescott.

The volumes now published bring the narrative down to the declaration of war between Charles and the Swiss—just the eve of the most stirring events of his troublous reign. The spirited manner in which it has been handled, so far, prepare us to greet with much interest the appearance of the succeeding part.

Winifred Bertram and the World she lived In. By the author of "The Schönberg-Cotta Family," &c. New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 479.

No modern writer for the religious public has attained a higher position than that which justly belongs to the author of this series of works. Their spirit is purely evangelical; their whole tendency is to promote true Christianity. They evince extraordinary historical knowledge, a remarkable talent for the portraiture of character, and an ability to transfer herself into

the age to which her story pertains. The members of the Cotta family think, feel, and act, as devout Romanists of the time of Luther, and not as the people of our generation. The number of the volumes flowing from the same facile pen may create misgiving lest the fountain should become exhausted, or its streams less clear and refreshing. We think, however, that our readers will not find in the present volume evidence of such exhaustion.

Songs Without Words. Leaves from a Very Old Book. Dedicated to Children by the author of "The Schönberg-Cotta Family," &c. New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway. Pp. 137.

A pretty book for children, designed to elicit instruction from the natural objects with which they are familiar. The language and style assume a degree of culture in juvenile readers rarely to be found, but the songs nevertheless are rendered intelligible, and they are full of meaning and beauty.

The Annals of Iowa. A Quarterly Publication of the State Historical Society at Iowa City. Numbers for January, April, July, and October, 1865. Edited by Theodore S. Parvin, Corresponding Secretary, Iowa City. Iowa: N. E. Brainerd.

We are glad to see this young and mighty state, amid other signs of intelligence and greatness, thus early taking measures to rescue from oblivion the facts connected with its original planting and settlement. Few of our states have enjoyed any such organ as a regular quarterly devoted to this special purpose. The enterprise and industry displayed in this periodical have supplied it with interesting matter, and will make it a repository of historical treasures for the benefit of coming generations.

On Saturday, January 6, 1866, Messrs. Ticknor & Fields will begin the Publication of a Weekly Journal entitled "Every Saturday:" a Journal of Choice Reading, Selected from Foreign Current Literature.

Much of the best literature of the day is found in the English and Continental magazines and periodicals; and it is the design of the publishers of this new journal to reproduce the choicest selections from these for American readers, in a form at once attractive and inexpensive. The publishers believe that such a journal, conducted upon the plan which they propose, will be not only entertaining and instructive in itself, but interesting and valuable as a reflex of foreign periodical literature of the better class.

Every Saturday is intended for Town and Country, for the Fireside, the Seaside, the Railway, and the Steamboat.

Its plan embraces Incidents of Travel and Adventure, Essays Critical and Descriptive, Serial Tales, Short Stories, Poems, Biographies, Literary Intelligence, &c., in connection with judicious selections from the admirable popular papers on Science which are constantly appearing in foreign periodicals. The value of these papers arises from the fact that scientific subjects, however harsh and dry in themselves, are here treated in so graphic and picturesque a style as to charm the reader while instructing him.

It will be, in short, the aim of its publishers that EVERY SATURDAY shall commend itself by its freshness and variety to all classes of intelligent and cultivated readers.

EVERY SATURDAY will contain each week thirty-two large octavo pages, handsomely printed in double columns, with an engraved title.

TERMS.—Single numbers, 10 cents. Subscription price, $5.00 per year, in advance.

Monthly Parts will be issued, containing one hundred and twenty-eight pages each, handsomely bound in an attractive cover, price 50 cents. Subscription price, $5.00 per year, in advance.

Clubbing Arrangement.—Subscribers to any of the other periodicals published by Ticknor & Fields will receive EVERY SATURDAY for $4.00 per year in advance. TICKNOR & FIELDS, Publishers, 124 Tremont street, Boston.

Although journals and magazines are rapidly increasing in number, the reading public is also increasing, not in number only, but also in intelligence. The Journal of Choice Reading which Messrs. Ticknor & Fields propose to issue under the title of "EVERY SATURDAY," bids fair from the plan on which it is to be conducted, as well as from the intelligence and enterprise of the publishers, to be a successful competitor for public favour.

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1866.

No. II.

ART. I.—*The Vicarious Sacrifice, grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 124 Grand street. 1866. 8vo. pp. 552.

JUDGING from its impression upon ourselves, we should say that this book of Dr. Bushnell is far inferior in power to his former one. That was an outburst, instinct with feeling and poetic fire. This is cold. It is addressed to the understanding. It is an attempt to justify to the reason, and in the presence of the Bible, a theory as to the work of Christ, which is the product of his imagination. It deals in analysis, in subtle distinctions, in arguments, which from the necessity of the case are sophistical, and which must be known to be false, even by those who may not see where their fallacy lies. A man undertakes a desperate task who attempts to argue against the intuitive judgments of the mind or conscience; or who strives to prove that all mankind for thousands of years, who have read and studied the Scriptures, are mistaken as to one of its most prominent and most important doctrines. The case of the Reformers affords no parallel to such an attempt in our own day. The Romanists did not admit the Scriptures to be perspicuous or designed for the people. They did not profess to believe the doctrines against which the Reformers protested,

on the authority of the Bible. They relied on the authority of the church; and the church with them was the hierarchy. The protest of the Reformers, therefore, was not against the interpretation which the people of God, with the Bible in their hands, had, on a great practical and experimental doctrine, been led with unanimity and under the inward teaching of the Spirit, to give to the sacred records. Any such attempt, we say is desperate. Every right-minded Christian would be authorized to put aside the volume in which such an experiment was made without further examination. No man is called upon, for his own sake, to refute arguments against what he knows is true. He is not bound to prove his own existence, or the existence of other men. Life is too short, and too much crowded with higher interests, to justify the waste of time in proving that white is white. Unfortunately, however, many men are not right-minded; and many more have no settled convictions on the plainest points of revealed doctrine. Hence the necessity of answering what the mass of experienced Christians feel that, so far as they are concerned, needs no answer.

A second introductory remark suggested by the perusal of Dr. Bushnell's book, is, that it contains nothing new. By which we mean, first, that it contains nothing essential to his theory, which was not contained in his former volume. This is true both as to what it denies, and as to what it affirms. Besides this, the theory concerning Christ's work propounded in this volume is not new in the history of theology. It did not originate with Dr. Bushnell. There is nothing new about it but its terminology. The reed-bird of the North is the rice-bird of the South; so the theory of the Socinians is the theory of Dr. Bushnell. Apart from the obsolete doctrine of some of the Fathers, human ingenuity has been unable to devise more than three general theories concerning the work of Christ.

The first is, that the eternal Son of God assumed our nature, fulfilled all righteousness as the substitute and representative of men, bore the curse of the law in their stead, and thus made expiation for their sins. Because his work is a full satisfaction to the justice of God designed for the recovery of

men to the image and enjoyment of God, it is represented as the most wonderful display of the wisdom, love, and especially of the grace of God, ever made to the universe; and, therefore, the most fruitful in beneficent results, being the great means which God has devised to promote the glory and blessedness of all orders of intelligences.

The second doctrine is that commonly known among us as the governmental theory. This is founded on the assumption that happiness is the highest good; that "the love of being," or the disposition to promote happiness, is not only the highest, but all virtue; and therefore that justice is only a form of benevolence. The primary end of punishment is consequently the good of God's moral government, or the prevention of the evil consequences of gratuitous forgiveness. Christ's work therefore is a satisfaction to rectoral justice; and rectoral justice is only a benevolent regard to the good of rational creatures. This doctrine flows necessarily from the view of divine justice presented by Leibnitz; and was adopted by the jurist Grotius, and assented to by his Socinian antagonists as removing their objections to the church doctrine of satisfaction. In this country it has been widely adopted as one of the modern, and American improvements in theology.

The third general theory is that which resolves the saving efficacy of Christ's work into its subjective influence. This theory comprehends many different views of the nature and design of the Redeemer's work. The three most comprehensive are the following: 1. That the work of Christ owes its power to the confirmation which it gives to important truths,—such as the immortality of the soul, the willingness of God to forgive sin, &c., &c. 2. That its power is due to the exhibition which it makes of self-sacrificing love. And 3d. The mystical doctrine of the renovation of humanity through a participation of the theanthropic life of Christ. It is to the second of these views the doctrine of Dr. Bushnell belongs. This will be rendered plain by a statement, first, of what he denies, and secondly, of what he affirms.

In the first place, he denies that any such attribute as justice belongs to the Divine character. That is, he denies that the moral excellence of God demands and renders necessary the

punishment of sin. There is an obvious distinction between righteousness and justice. The former is general rectitude or rightness; the latter is concerned in the distribution of rewards and punishment, according to the general understanding of the term; but according to Dr. Bushnell it is concerned exclusively in connecting suffering with sin as a means of the recovery of the sinner. That is, it is only benevolence in one of the modes of its exercise. He distinguishes between law before government, and law after government. He assumes that God himself is subject to the eternal law of right; so also are all rational creatures. It is supposable that a universe of such beings should exist, subject not to God, but subject with God to one and the same rule of right. Should any of these intelligent creatures sin, God would "feel himself elected" to be a ruler, to institute government. P. 244. Here comes in statute law; and, justice to enforce them, penalties, &c., all designed for redemption, or recovery of the apostates. "The problem cannot, therefore, be to satisfy, or pacify justice, but simply to recompose in the violated law the shattered, broken souls, who have thrown down both themselves and it, by their disobedience." P. 246. What he denies is, that there is any such attribute in God, which requires "an exact doing upon wrong what it deserves." P. 267. He admits that there is what he calls "a wrath-principle," in the Supreme Being, which "enables him to inflict pain without shrinking;" just as a benevolent surgeon does. But that is not justice. Hence justice and mercy are one and the same, only different in terms or modes of expression. When a regard to the welfare of the victims suffering evil leads to the exercise of kindness, we call it mercy; when it leads to the infliction of pain, we call it justice. This is the doctrine of the volume before us, on this point, covered in a wonderful amplitude of words and figures. Its thoughts are smothered in rose-leaves. The whole system of Dr. Bushnell is founded in this denial of the justice of God. There might have been, he tells us, just such a scheme of redemption as that effected by Christ, "which has nothing to do with justice proper; being related only to that *quasi* justice which is the blind effect, in moral natures, of a violation of their necessary law." The righteousness of God "never

requires him to execute justice under political analogies, save as it requires him to institute an administrative government in the same." "Law and justice might be instituted as co-factors of redemption, having it for their object simply to work with redemption, and serve the same ends with spiritual renovation." P. 248. The language which Dr. Bushnell at times allows himself to use in reference to the justice of God, must be very painful to his readers. It is language which is seldom heard except from the lips of irreligious men. We are told in representing God as just, in the ordinary sense of the term, we adopt the heathen idea of the Godhead, representing him as thirsting for vengeance, and only to be appeased by suffering.

2. In denying any such perfection as is commonly understood by justice to God, Dr. Bushnell explicitly denies that there has been any expiation of sin made by the Redeemer. Expiation he pronounces to be a purely pagan idea. He denies that it has any support from the sacrifices of the Old Testament or the didactic statements of the New. "What is expiation?" he asks. "It does not simply signify the fact that God is propitiated, but it brings in the pagan, or Latin idea (for the word is Latin), that the sacrifice offered softens God, or assuages the anger of God, as being an evil, or pain, contributed to his offended feeling." "The distinctive idea of expiation is that God is to have an evil given to him by consent, for an evil due by retribution." P. 486. "The classic and all pagan sentiments of worship, being thus corrupted by the false idea of expiation, the later Jewish commentators and Christian theologians finally took up the conception, laying claim to it as a worthy and genuine element in all sacrifices, whether those of the law, or even the great sacrifice of the gospel itself. And now there is nothing more devoutly asserted, or more reverently believed, than our essential need of an expiatory sacrifice, and the fact that such a sacrifice is made for our salvation, in the cross of Jesus Christ." P. 488. "We never speak," he says, "of good deeds, or sentiments, or sacrifices of love, as expiations. Nothing is expiatory that does not turn upon the fact of damage or pain, or just punishment. Neither is there any difficulty of discovering from the manner in which theologians speak of expiation, that they think of God

as having some evil, or pain, or naked suffering offered him for sin, and that, on account of such offering, he may release the evil, or pain, or suffering, his unsatisfied wrath would otherwise have exacted. Thus, taking the mildest form of superstition, it will be maintained that God's wrath is to be averted by sacrifices, that is, by something given to wrath, that is wrath's proper food; which can of course be only some kind of pain or evil." P. 489. "If it is a mere feeling in God which is to be placated by an expiatory sacrifice, then we have to ask, is God such a being, that having a good mortgage title to pain or suffering, as against an offender, he will never let go the title till he gets the pain—if not from him, then from some other? Such a conception of God is simply shocking." P. 491. It is indeed shocking to hear a Divine attribute thus caricatured; to hear justice, which is to the moral world what gravitation is to the material universe, degraded into blood-thirstiness. How this can be done by a man of moral culture is a mystery. Washington was not a monster when he signed the death warrant of Andre; nor is a judge blood-thirsty when he passes sentence upon an assassin. We have no knowledge of God at all unless what is virtue in us be virtue in him. This is a principle which, when it suits his purpose, Dr. Bushnell pushes to an extreme. And yet he violates it recklessly when it works against his theory. Dr. Bushnell admits that God punishes sin. But punishment is pain or evil voluntarily inflicted in satisfaction of justice. Dr. Bushnell indeed makes no difference between the pain which follows a wound, and the suffering which follows sin. He seems to consider both as "the blind effect" of the nature of things. But who constituted the nature of things? Who so ordered our physical and moral constitution that fire applied to living flesh should cause pain, and that crime should burn the conscience? Evil does not cease to be penal because it is a natural consequence. It may be that the sufferings of a future state are to a great degree the natural and necessary consequences of the order which God has established in his universe. But they do not, on that account, cease to be judicial inflictions. The most awful judgment denounced in the Bible is reprobation; which is simply giving the sinner up to himself and his sins.

It matters not, therefore, whether the pain or evil be a natural consequence, or whether it be inflicted *ab extra*, it is in either case punishment; and in either case determined by the will and judgment of God. This being admitted, it follows that the infliction of pain on account of sin, is no proof of blood-thirstiness. The wanton infliction of pain is cruel. But its infliction for a high end, by one having authority, may be wise, just, and good. The only question is, therefore, what are the ends which justify and demand the infliction of evil for the punishment of sin? The thing is done by an infinitely holy God, as Dr. Bushnell admits, and as even Deists admit. Why? Dr. Bushnell and others say, for the reformation or redemption of the offender. Others say, for the prevention of crime. Others say, that these are subordinate, though important ends for the infliction of evil on account of sin, whether in the form of penalty or chastisement, but that the primary and immediate ground of such infliction is the ill-desert of sin; and that its efficacy as a moral preventive of crime arises out of the fact that it is inflicted on the ground of intrinsic ill-desert. That the reformation of the offender is the primary or sole end of punishment is contrary to the Scriptures, and to the universal judgment of men. Among men it is impossible that such should be the object of punishment, when the penalty is death; and no less impossible in the Divine government, when the penalty is eternal death, the utter and final reprobation of the offender. Every man finds in his own consciousness the sentiment which demands the punishment of sin for its own sake, irrespective of the effects of punishment upon himself or upon others. A sinful soul, if alone in the universe, in the presence of a holy God, would feel the sense of guilt in all its force. No man who has ever experienced conviction of sin is ignorant that sin is guilt as well as pollution; that it stands in a relation to justice as distinct and as necessary as it sustains to holiness; and that expiation is as necessary for pardon, as regeneration is to purity and peace. This sentiment is natural. It does not belong to any one class of men; it is not peculiar to those who have been subjected to any one mode of moral culture. It belongs to all men. It is impressed on all human languages. It is revealed in the social,

political, and religious usages of all races of men. It just as undeniably belongs to the constitution of our nature, and is just as obviously a revelation of the nature of God, in whose image man was created, as reason or conscience. Punishment, therefore, that is, evil inflicted in satisfaction of justice, is morally right. It is not an expression of malice, or revenge, or blood-thirstiness, but of a necessary constituent element of moral perfection. But punishment is the expiation of guilt. That is its nature and effect. If punishment is morally right, so is expiation. If the one be demanded by the nature of God, so is the other. If the one be consistent with love, so is the other. Whether that expiation be made by the offender himself, or by a substitute, does not alter the thing. It is expiation still; and it is expiation which Dr. Bushnell pronounces to be a pagan idea, shocking in its nature, and unknown to the Scriptures, even in the sacrifices of the old dispensation. That it is shocking to him, we must admit on his own testimony; and this doubtless is the reason why he rejects and labours so hard to disprove it. But it is not shocking to the minds of the vast majority of men of all ages and nations, as is proved by its universal adoption; nor to the great body of God's people, as is proved by its incorporation in the doctrines and inmost religious life of every Christian church on earth; nor yet is it shocking to the infinitely holy God, as is proved not only in its being the corner-stone of the Divine plan of redemption, but also by every punitive declaration of his word and every infliction of his providence. If God punishes sin, he demands an expiation for sin. And therefore expiation is something holy, just, and good. The rising of the human heart against it, is no objection to its righteous character. This is the pith and substance of all Dr. Bushnell's book, so far as the denials are concerned. He rejects expiation, because the idea shocks him; and hence there is nothing in God which demands it; there is nothing in the Old Testament sacrifices which imply it; and nothing in the work of Christ which involves any such idea. Then, unless the whole Christian world be mistaken, there can be no salvation for sinners.

Dr. Bushnell's objections to the doctrine of expiation are refuted not only by the fact that the idea of expiation is in-

cluded in that of punishment; by the universal recognition of the justice and integrity of such punishment; by the still more authoritative sanction derived from the work of the Spirit in the hearts of the people of God; by its lying at the foundation of the whole sacrificial system of the Scriptures, both in regard to the offerings under the Old Testament economy, and in reference to the great expiatory sacrifice of Christ. It is little less than an insult to the common sense of men, to attempt to show that the sacrifices of the Mosaic economy were not expiatory, but reformatory; not intended to expiate the guilt of the offender, but to cleanse him from moral pollution. Dr. Bushnell's arguments on this point are so unsubstantial they hardly admit of being handled. He says the word used signifies *to cover*, and to cover is to hide, or remove from sight; and therefore properly expresses the idea of cleansing. The offender has his sins covered because the service tends to lead him to repentance and a new life, and thus he is cleansed from inward pollution. Sin is guilt, however, as well as pollution, and needs to be hidden from the eye of justice. It is thus covered, and can only be covered by expiation. And thus the soul, according to Scripture, is cleansed from guilt by blood; as it is cleansed from pollution by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. To deny that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were expiatory can only be done by denying the express assertions of the Bible, and by ignoring the import of all the rites connected with the sacrificial services, and by overlooking the specific effects attributed to offerings for sin. The direct and specific design of the sin-offering is declared to be, not reformation, that was the remote, or ultimate design, as in the great sacrifice of Christ, but forgiveness. If a man sinned he was required to bring a proper offering, "and the priest shall make atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him." This is the constantly recurring formula. The words in the Hebrew are just as perspicuous as they are in the English version. In neither case do they admit of any interpretation which excludes the idea of expiation. Sin incurs a penalty, that penalty was remitted on the condition of the death of a victim in the place of the sinner. It is everywhere, constantly and distinctly asserted, that pardon, deliverance from a justly incurred pen-

alty, was the design of every sin-offering. They were therefore not merely "lustral," in Dr. Bushnell's sense of the word. They were not designed to cleanse from pollution, but from guilt; and this cleansing from guilt, is everywhere represented in Scripture as the indispensable condition precedent to reconciliation with God, and reconciliation with God the indispensable antecedent to inward holiness or sanctification. These are the elementary principles of the plan of salvation as revealed in the Bible. And the rejection of these truths is the rejection of the gospel. That the design of the Hebrew sacrifices was to make expiation for sin is, however, clear, not only from the obvious meaning of the formulas above referred to, but also from the express assertions of the Bible as to the mode in which that expiation was effected. It was by substitution. It was by one suffering in the place of another. Life was given for life; soul for soul. I have given, saith God, the blood, in which is the Life of the victim, upon the altar, for your life. This is the declaration contained in Lev. xvii. 11. And hence כֹּפֶר from כָּפַר means "a ransom." Something given for a person or thing as the condition of deliverance. The one was substituted for the other. Thus in Exodus xxi. 30, "If there be laid upon him a sum of money (an atonement, something to cover his offence) then he shall give for the ransom of his soul, whatsoever is laid upon him." Isa. xliii. 3, "I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." A sin-offering, therefore, according to the Scriptures, was an expiation, a substitute, a ransom. The victim was put in the place of the offender; its blood was taken for his blood; its life for his life. A sacrifice was demanded in cases where it is impossible that the moral purification of the offerers should be the object. If a man was found slain, and the murderer could not be discovered, the elders of the city were to bring a heifer and offer it as an atonement, that its blood might be taken for the innocent blood which had been shed. Deut. xxi.

All the ceremonies attending the offering of sacrifice for sin lose their significance if the ideas of substitution and expiation be excluded. The offender brought a faultless animal to the altar; he laid his hands upon its head, confessing his sin; the

victim was slain and its blood sprinkled on the altar or towards the tabernacle, and the offender was freed from the penalty which he had incurred. These acts are as significant as words. They teach that the victim was substituted for the offender; its blood taken for his blood; or, as the Bible itself expresses, its life for his life. This interpretation of the service is given, or this view of the nature of the Old Testament, is adopted by all classes of commentators and theologians, even by those who care nothing about what the Bible teaches; by Gesenius, De Wette, Bauer, as well as Hengenstenberg and Tholuck. And such has been the accepted meaning of sacrifices among all people and in every age of the world. They were always offered in expiation of guilt and in hope of propitiating an offended God. This is admitted in regard to the pagan world. But in admitting this, it is admitted that the sense of guilt is universal; that the common consciousness of men teaches that God is a just being whose nature leads to the punishment of sin; and that expiation is necessary to forgiveness. In denying these truths, therefore, we deny the intuitive convictions of our sinful race, and set ourselves in opposition to the voice of nature, as well as to the word of God. Besides all this, the Bible expresses by "bearing sin," what it teaches by saying a victim was made a sacrifice for sin. But "to bear sin" never means to sanctify, it always means to bear the penalty of sin. And therefore if a sacrifice bore the sins of the offender, the Scriptures declare that he bore the punishment of his offences, bore it in his place and in order to his forgiveness. This was the symbolical meaning of the Old Testament sacrifices, and it was this which gave them all their value. But if this be so, then Christ's sufferings were truly expiatory. He bore our sins. He died the just for the unjust, in the same sense as the lamb died for the offender under the Mosaic economy. Although Dr. Bushnell in the face of the clearest teachings of Scripture, and especially of the whole design of the Epistle to the Hebrews, denies that the Old Testament sacrifices were typical of the sacrifice of Christ, yet he admits that the one saves just as the other did. And therefore if those were expiatory, so also was the sacrifice of Christ. On this subject there seems to be no room for argument, provided men are

agreed on two points; first, that the Bible is the word of God and our only infallible rule of faith; and secondly, that the Scriptures are to be historically interpreted, that is, that we are bound to take them in the sense in which they were intended to be understood by the persons to whom they were addressed. If the words sin, law, justice, priest, atonement, sacrifice, forgiveness, and so on, are not to be taken by us in the sense in which it can be historically proved they were understood by the sacred writers and their contemporaries, then we are without any rule of faith, or any reliable source of knowledge, and the Bible may be made to mean just what any theory-builder, whether rationalistic or transcendental, may choose. Dr. Bushnell is one of those theory-builders, and his doctrine has no other foundation than his own imagination. He can bring it in to agreement with the Bible only by making the Bible conform to his theory in despite of the plainest and most authoritative rules of interpretation.

As he denies the justice of God and repudiates with horror the idea of expiation, of course there can be no such thing as justification. There may be free pardon, and the restoration of the favour of God, which he admits; but justification he denies. Justification is a declaration that the demands of justice are satisfied. But if there be no justice and no satisfaction, there can be no such declaration. The word, as is usual in such cases, he retains, while the idea is discarded. With him justification is a making morally good. The sinner is recovered from his sins; is made inwardly pure, restored to the love of God, *i. e.*, is made to love him, and on that account is loved by him. This is justification. He endeavours to show that he differs from the Romanists who confound (or unite) justification with sanctification. Because with him justification is in the consciousness and sanctification below it. This amounts to nothing. With Romanists sanctification is not confined to the states or exercises of the consciousness. They hold that justification includes the infusion of new habits of grace, which lie below all conscious holy exercises, and are their proximate cause. So far from Dr. Bushnell's doctrine being in advance of that of Rome on this subject, it is a thousand degrees below it. Romanists admit the doctrine of

expiation; they admit that the work of Christ was a true and proper satisfaction to the justice of God for the sins of men; they admit that his satisfaction is the sole ground for the remission of original sin, as well as of all sins committed before baptism; and they hold that it is the ground on which God visits postbaptismal sins with temporal penalties (which may be satisfied or remitted) instead of eternal death. All this Dr. Bushnell denies. He would push the guilty and trembling soul clean off of the immoveable rock of Christ's righteousness, into what? Why, into the hell which is within him and about him. He would bid him rest all his hopes on what he himself is. If sin be unsubdued in his own heart, if he has not a subjective heavenly state, he is not an heir of heaven. Every thing depends, not upon what Christ has done for him, but upon what the sinner himself inwardly is. All his hopes rest on his own holiness. We have not the least apprehension that there is strength enough in Dr. Bushnell's arm to push into the abyss the weakest soul who has, even in darkness, touched the everlasting Rock; but he may be able to prevent those who are seeking a sure resting-place from seeking it where alone it can be found.

Will our readers pardon us here for a short digression. They are aware that in this country and elsewhere a system of theology has prevailed, founded upon two principles, which are regarded as moral axioms. The first is, that no man can be justly required to do more than he has the plenary power to perform. If he is required to love God with all his soul and with all his strength, to hate and avoid all sin, he must be able to do so. From this, one of two things follows: either, assuming the obligation to remain to be thus perfect in heart and life, every man has the ability to conform himself to this high standard of duty; or, the standard of duty must be brought down to the level of his ability. If we cannot love or hate at pleasure, then the command to love is an absurdity; and love must be reduced to a mere purpose. The second fundamental principle of the system referred to is, that all sin consists in sinning; or, that moral character can be predicated of voluntary acts alone. Hence there can be no original sin, or corruption of nature; no inherent sin or holiness; no principles or habits

morally good or evil. It is a satisfaction to see that Dr. Bushnell repudiates both these principles. He admits the entire inability of sinners to restore themselves to the image of God. In answer to the question, Whether God could forgive sin on the ground of our mere repentance? he answers, "If he could, meaning only what is commonly meant by remission, the remission would make no change and confer no benefit whatever. Besides the question only asks, what could God bestow, if we should do the impossible? For no man is able, by his own act, to really cast off sin, and renew himself in good." P. 424. Repentance, therefore, for a sinner left to himself is "impossible." As to the second principle, Dr. Bushnell is equally explicit. To the objection against his doctrine of subjective justification, that it confounds justification with sanctification, he says, justification is in the consciousness, sanctification below it. "The consciousness of the subject, in justification, is raised in its order, filled with the confidence of right, set free from the bondage of fears and scruples of legality; but there is a vast realm back of consciousness, or below it, which remains to be changed or sanctified, and never will be, except a new habit be generated by time, and the better consciousness descending into the secret roots below, gets a healing into them more and more perfect." P. 440. All voluntary exercises, of course, are in the consciousness; if therefore there be a "vast realm below the consciousness," which needs sanctification, then there is something in the soul besides voluntary exercises of which moral character may be predicated. "And when they arose early on the morrow morning, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face before the ark of the Lord: and the head of Dagon, and both the palms of his hands were cut off upon the threshold; only the fishy part of Dagon was left to him." This was pleasant news for the Israelites. So it is pleasant for us to see the Dagon of a false theology lying headless and handless before the ark of God's truth.

To return to our subject. Justification, as taught by all the churches of the Reformation, and virtually by the whole Christian world, is "an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received

by faith alone." According to this view, justification is: 1. As to its nature, a declarative and judicial act. 2. It consists in the forgiveness of sins, and accepting the sinner as righteous. 3. Its ground is the righteousness of Christ. 4. Its condition, or instrumental cause, is faith. Those who receive and rest on the righteousness of Christ are justified, and if justified, are glorified. Those who do not then rest on that righteousness are not justified, and are not saved. Every one of these points Dr. Bushnell denies. He denies that justification is declarative or judicial. It consists, according to him, in making its object or subject inwardly good, restoring him to the image of God. He says on p. 415, that the three words, *righteousness*, *just*, and *justifier of*, are moral, and not judicial. "There is no reference of thought, whatever, to God's retributive justice, or to the acquittal passed on guilty men, because the score of their account with God's justice has been made even by the sufferings of Christ." On page 427, we are told "that justification has no reference to justice." "To be justified by faith means to be justified by yielding our members instruments of righteousness unto God." P. 428. The difference between justification and sanctification is, that the former is in the consciousness, and the latter below it. There is, however, he says, "no objection to saying that, in a certain general way, they are one —just as faith is one with love, and love with regeneration, and this with genuine repentance, and all good states with all others. The same divine life as quickened of God is supposed in every sort of holy exercise, and the different names we give them represent real and important differences of meaning, according as we consider the new life quickened in relation to our own agency, or to God's, or to means accepted, trust reposed, or effects wrought. In the same way justification is sanctification, and both are faith; and yet their difference is by no means annihilated." P. 441. Justification therefore is not an act of God, but an inward state of the mind; a form of the divine life in the soul.

In order to establish the doctrine which subverts the faith of the whole Protestant world, and casts the sinner into utter despair, he attempts to prove against all lexicographers and interpreters, against indeed the convictions of every reader of

the Bible, and every speaker of the English language, that to justify means *to make good*, to make subjectively righteous, or conformed to the law of God. If this be so, what business has the word in the language. We have the words to purify, to cleanse, to sanctify, to reform, to regenerate, and a multitude of others, to express the idea of inward purification. What is the use of this other word *to justify?* What is a word, but an expression of thought. But this word expresses no thought of its own; no thought which is not more appropriately and definitely expressed by other words. It is attempting to argue against a palpable fact, to strive to prove that to justify means to make good. When we justify a man for what he has done, we do not reform him. We simply declare that he was right, that the law of the land or the law of God does not condemn his conduct. When we justify God, we declare that God is right in all he does, as the Psalmist, and every convinced sinner, justifies God in his own condemnation. Justification is antithetical to condemnation. If the latter does not mean to make wicked, the former cannot mean to make good. "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned." "Wisdom is justified of her children." The Pharisee justifies himself. We are said to be justified without works; but we cannot be good without goodness. A judge is forbidden to justify the wicked for a reward. He that justifieth the wicked, says Solomon, is an abomination. There is no use however of citing examples. There is not a single instance in the New Testament in which δικαιόω means to make holy, or morally good; and there is not a single case in the Old Testament in which the Hiphil form of צָדַק is so used. The only doubtful case in the New Testament is Rev. xxii. 11; but there the word is used in a middle sense, and moreover the text is very doubtful. That Dr. Bushnell should say, as he does on p. 420, that he has established his point that δικαιόω is not used in a declarative or judicial sense, but means to make morally good, "in a manner that leaves no room for dispute," is an exhibition of the very insanity of self-conceit. So far from the word in Scripture always having that sense, it never has it. He need only ask the first Sunday-school child he meets what "justify" means, to be satisfied that it has been attempting not

only to pervert the meaning of a word, but to upset the intuitive judgment of the common consciousness of men. It is very true that the adjective *δίκαιος* and the noun *δικαιοσύνη* are often used in a moral sense; as when the Scriptures speak of a righteous man, or of the righteous God. But this has nothing to do with the usage of the verb. Indeed Dr. Bushnell feels that he is arguing against a self-evident truth, by proposing to substitute the word "righteouser" for "justifier." The former he makes to mean one who renders subjectively righteous, or good. What is this but an admission that justifier does not mean one who makes good, and cannot be made to convey that idea to an English ear. Of course he urges the common objection against justification being a declarative act, that it is a contradiction to declare a man righteous who is not righteous. This, he tells us, is making "the gospel end off in a fiction that falsifies even the eternal distinctions of character." P. 422. It is indeed impossible that God should declare a man to be good who is not good, or wise who is not wise. And therefore if the word righteous has only a moral sense, it is impossible that God should declare the unrighteous to be righteous. But every one knows, and every one, except Dr. Bushnell, admits, that the Greek word *δίκαιος* (and the English word righteous) besides its moral, has also a judicial, or forensic sense. In other words, it expresses sometimes the relation of a man to holiness, and sometimes his relation to justice; in other words, sometimes his relation to the precept, and sometimes to the penalty of the law. In the latter case it is antithetical to *ὑπόδικος*. There is none *δίκαιος* (righteous), says Paul, but the whole world is *ὑπόδικος* (*under condemnation*) before God. When therefore God pronounces the sinner just, he does not declare that he is morally what he ought to be, but that the demands of justice, so far as he is concerned, have been satisfied. Therefore he is said "to justify the ungodly." The ground of the judgment is not what the sinner is or has done, but what has been done for him. Justification under the gospel, Paul declares to be the "imputation of righteousness without works," that is, to those who have no moral excellence of their own on which a declaration of righteousness can be founded.

In teaching that God in justifying the soul imparts to it, or

"impresses upon it his own character," Dr. Bushnell of course denies that it includes "the pardon of sin." According to him there is properly no such thing as pardon. You can no more forgive sin, than you can forgive a disease. The only way to remove the suffering connected with disease, is to heal the patient, and the only way to free the soul from the suffering connected with sin, is to reform the sinner. In neither case is there a remission of a penalty in the ordinary sense of the word. As this idea of remission and penalty pervades the volume before us, it is not easy to quote particular proof passages. We have already seen that on p. 424, Dr. B. says, that remission in the common sense of the term "would confer no benefit whatever." On page 449, he says of Christ, "His work terminates, not in the release of penalties by due compensation, but in the transformation of character, and the rescue, in that manner, of guilty men from the retributive causations provoked by their sins. He does not prepare remission of sins in the sense of mere letting go, but he executes the remission, by taking away the sins, and dispensing the justification of life, (by which he means the infusion of spiritual life). This one word Life is the condensed import of all that he is, or undertakes to be." All pardon, therefore, consists in deliverance from the inward power of sin. Remission which does not include the removal of sin, is declared to be "only a kind of formality, or verbal discharge, that carries practically no discharge with it." P. 424. In forgiveness, he says, God, in the declaration of his righteousness, gets "such a hold of the souls that are sweltering in disorder, under the natural effects of transgression, as to bring them out of their disorder into righteousness. By his moral power, which is the power of his righteousness supernaturally revealed in Christ, he masters the retributive causations of their nature, and they receive more than a ground of remission; viz., the executed fact of remission, or spiritual release. Otherwise, under a mere letting go, the bad causes hold fast like fire in brimstone, and refuse to be cheated of their prey." P. 426. Remission is, therefore, "spiritual release." Most errors, even the gravest, are half truths. It is true that there are evils inseparable from the existence of sin in the soul; that these evils constitute a large part of its

penalty; and that deliverance from those evils can only be effected by sanctification. But it is not true that the natural consequences of sin are its only punishment; nor that remission and sanctification are ever confounded; nor are they related as cause and effect. The two things are distinct in their nature, and are always distinguished in the Bible and by the common sense of men. And moreover, it is no less true, there neither is nor can be any sanctification or destruction of the power of sin in the soul, until there has been antecedent remission of its penalty. On Dr. Bushnell's scheme, no sinful soul can ever be saved, if Paul's doctrine of sanctification be true. He teaches clearly in the sixth and seventh chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, that so long as the sinner is under condemnation, he brings forth fruit unto death; that it is not until he is delivered from condemnation, by the body or sacrifice of Christ, that he brings forth fruit unto God. He must first be justified, before he can be sanctified. This is the theology of the apostle; and it is a great blessing that the religious experience of God's people always accords with the doctrinal teachings of the Scriptures, while it utterly refuses to harmonize with the speculative theories of imaginative and presumptuous men.

The idea that the punishment of sin is only in its natural consequences, and that remission is merely deliverance from the natural operations of moral evil in the soul, as freedom from the pain of a burn can be effected only by allaying the inflammation, is so repugnant to Scripture and to common sense as to need no refutation. The expulsion of our first parents from paradise; the deluge; raining fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah; the death of the first-born of the Egyptians; all the plagues brought on Pharaoh; drought, famine, pestilence, threatened as the punishment of the Hebrews; were not the natural consequences of sin, but positive punitive inflictions. Indeed, almost all the judgments threatened in the Bible are of that character. And every human being knows that when he prays for pardon, he prays for something different from holiness. When our Lord said to the man sick of the palsy, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," no man ever supposed he meant, "Be thou holy." It is true that

the gospel in making provision for the pardon of sin, provides also for the sanctification of the sinner; that salvation in sin is a contradiction and absurdity. But it is utter infatuation to deny the one in order to maintain the other. We need both pardon and sanctification, and cannot have the one without the other. Nevertheless they are distinct and separate gifts of grace through the mediation of Christ.

It need not be added that in denying justice, expiation, judicial justification and remission of the penalty of sin, as any thing different from the destruction of its power, he also denies that Christ or his righteousness is the ground of our justification. One of his distinct propositions, p. 423, is, "Christ not a ground, but a power of justification."

Such are the denials involved in Dr. Bushnell's theory. He denies what has, at least for ages as he admits, been the faith of the church, as to the method of salvation. What then is his own doctrine? How is it that Christ secures the salvation of sinners? It is by the power of expression; it is by the manifestation which he makes of Divine love. There are two kinds of power, "The fiat power, and moral power." The former he seems to exclude entirely from the work of salvation. Every thing is attributed to the moral power of Christ. This power he gradually acquired by a long course of self-denying, self-sacrificing labour for the restoration of fallen men. His sufferings had nothing to do with the saving efficacy of his work, except as the necessary incidents of the task which he had assumed. If a missionary goes to labour in an unhealthy climate, he may suffer, and perhaps perish under its influence. But he did not go in order thus to suffer. That was no part of his missionary work. That he willingly endures such suffering in the prosecution of his mission, may enhance his moral power over those among whom he labours, but sufferings have no specific virtue, they are merely incidental. This is Dr. Bushnell's own illustration, which makes his meaning plainer than any of his formal didactic statements. He supposes (see p. 396,) a case of a prison in a miasmatic district, where the fell poison of the atmosphere decimates the inmates almost every week. "It comes to the knowledge of a good monk that a prisoner, formerly his bitter enemy, is infected with the poison.

Whereupon the godly man goes to his relief, nurses and attends upon him until he is recovered and goes free, while the benefactor takes the infection and dies. The rescued man expresses his gratitude by saying his friend "bore my punishment"—"became the criminal for me"—"gave his life for mine"—"died that I might live," &c., &c. After a time "the dull, blind-hearted literalizer takes up all these fervours of expression in the letters and reported words of the reputed felon, showing most conclusively that the good monk actually got the other's crime imputed to him, took the guilt of it, suffered the punishment of it, died in his place, and satisfied the justice of the law that he might be released! Why the malefactor himself would even have shuddered at the thought of a construction so revolting, hereafter to be put upon his words."

Christ therefore saves us as the suppositious monk saved the felon. Our Lord's sufferings arose only from the moral and physical malaria of the world into which he came. He "simply came into the corporate state of evil, and bore it with us—faithful unto death for our recovery." P. 514. The state of corporate evil which follows sin as its natural effect, the Scriptures call it the curse; "and it is directly into this that Christ is entered by his incarnation. In his taking of the flesh, he becomes a true member of the race, subject to all the corporate liabilities of his bad relationship." P. 386. Such being the nature of Christ's vicarious sacrifice, there is nothing in it peculiar to him. It arises necessarily out of the nature of love; and therefore every rational being governed by love, is impelled in the presence of evil to make such sacrifices. This is true of God himself. From the entrance of sin and misery into the universe, he has suffered just what Christ suffered. There is a Gethsemane in the Divine nature. God cannot but suffer whenever he sees evil, and he must strive to correct it and deliver its victims. "Love is an universally vicarious principle." "See how it is in the case of a mother. She loves her child, and it comes out in that fact, and from it, that she watches for the child, bears all its pains and sicknesses on her own feeling, and when it is wronged, is stung herself by the wrong put upon it, more bitterly far than the child." P. 46. "Given the universality of love, the universality of vicarious

sacrifice is given also." P. 48. This being the case the Eternal Father suffered for us as truly and as much as Christ did. Christ did not do the same things in his first year as in his last, so the sufferings of the Father were not the same in kind as those of the Son after the incarnation. But they were as real and as truly vicarious. "In the ante-Christian era may have been one of the heaviest points of sacrifice, that there must be so long a detention, and that so great love must be unexpressed, until the fulness of time had come." P. 60. What is true of the Father must be true of the Holy Spirit. "Whatever we may say, or hold, or believe, concerning the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, we are to affirm in the same manner of God. The whole deity is in it, in it from eternity and will to eternity be." P. 73. This he calls a "full and carefully tested discovery." "There is a cross in God before the wood is seen upon Calvary; hid in God's own virtue itself, struggling on heavily in burdened feeling through all the previous ages, and struggling as heavily now even in the throne of the worlds." P. 73. The Holy Spirit bears our sins "precisely as Christ himself did in his sacrifice. He is, in fact, a Christ continued, in all that distinguishes the offering and priesthood of Christ, and is fitly represented in the same way." P. 74. "It requires quite as much suffering patience, and affliction of feeling, or even of what is called passion, to carry on the work of the Spirit, as it did to fulfil the ministry and bear the cross of Jesus." P. 76. He is well aware, Dr. Bushnell says, "how very distant such conceptions are from the commonly received impressions of the Holy Spirit." P. 74. But more than all this, "all good intelligences are in vicarious sacrifice." This is true of the holy angels and glorified saints. They perform a priestly work; they bear a priestly character as being intercessors for men. P. 103. They are concerned for sin as God is, and suffer for our sins as Christ did. All this is true also of men here on earth. "Vicarious suffering was in no way peculiar to Christ, save in degree." P. 107. "The true and simple account of his (Christ's) suffering is, that he had such a heart as would not suffer him to be turned away from us, and that he suffered for us even as love must willingly suffer for its enemy." P. 108. All therefore who have his love must suffer,

in their measure, in the same way. Their suffering are vicarious sacrifice in the same sense that his were. See the whole of Ch. V. Part I. Christ therefore did nothing extraordinary. He had no "superlative goodness." He did nothing but what he was "bound to do." See pp. 91, 105, &c. He did nothing more or less than what the common standard of holiness and right requires. P. 108.

Such being the nature of vicarious sacrifice, Christ is in no sense a special Saviour; he does no more than the Father and the Spirit ever did and are still doing; he did only what saints and angels in heaven, and saints on earth are ever doing, except that he brings the power of self-sacrificing love more home to us. He "came simply to be the manifested love of God." P. 141.

The salvation of men, as above stated, is effected, according to Dr. Bushnell, not by the fiat power, but by the moral power of God. Christ is the power of God unto salvation, not as an example, nor merely by the revelation of the love of God, as softness, or instinctive sympathy, (p. 171,) but by the manifestation of all the moral perfections, or greatness of God. It is the power of character. The power of Alexander was that of force, that of Socrates, of character; so in the case of Napoleon and Washington. P. 172. For Christ to take away our sins, "by the force that is manifested in him, is the same thing as to be the moral power which masters the soul's inward disorder, and renews it to holiness of life." P. 180. But this moral power is not inherent; it is not an attribute. It is something acquired, as by Howard, George Fox, and Whitefield. Men think away God's perfections in thinking of them as attributes. They become dry words. "We feel him a platitude more than as a person." "As a kind of milky-way over our heads; vast enough in the matter of extension, but evanescently dim to our feelings." P. 187. He became incarnate in order to obtain moral power. "The undertaking is to obtain, through him (Christ) and the facts and processes of his life, a new kind of power, viz. moral power; the same that is obtained by human conduct under human methods. It will be Divine power still, only it will not be attribute power. That is the power of his idea. This new power is to be power cumula-

tive gained by him among men, as truly as they gain it wit each other." P. 188. "His (Christ's) reality is what he expresses; under the law of expression; the power, the great name, he thus obtains under forms of human conduct that make their address to reason, conviction, feeling, passion, sympathy, imagination, faith, and the receptivities generally of the moral nature. What rational person ever imagined that he could state, in a defined formula, the import of any great character; Moses, for example, Plato, Scipio, Washington." P. 214. Thus it is Christ saves us. He acquires, as others do, a moral power, by his life, his deeds of love, by the works of self-denial, labour, and suffering he performed, differing in nothing from the power of character, which attaches to great and good men, except in degree. And this moral power, or character, so operates on the minds of men as to make them good, and by making them good frees them from the corporate evil, or the natural causes of pain inseparable from a state of sin. Such is the nature, and such the method of Christian salvation, according to Dr. Bushnell.

No intelligent reader can rise from the perusal of this book without being convinced that its author has no correct idea of the nature of Christian theology or of the duty of a Christian theologian. Christian theology is nothing but the facts and truths of the Bible arranged in their natural order and exhibited in their mutual relations. The order in which these truths are to be arranged, and the relations in which they stand, are not to be arbitrarily determined. Both are determined by the nature of the truths themselves, and by the explicit teachings of the Scriptures. Such being the nature of theology, the duty of the theologian is first to ascertain and authenticate the facts of Scripture, that is, make it clear that they are indeed contained in the word of God. This induction of facts must, as far as possible, be exhaustive. All must be collected, and each must be allowed its due value. No one is to be ignored or modified. Then secondly, the theologian, having obtained his facts, is to present them in their natural order; that is, the order determined by their nature.

The philosophy of the facts is in the facts; underlies, and arranges them, and determines their mutual relation. The

theologian has no more right to explain the facts by his own philosophy, than he has to manufacture the facts for his philosophy. His business is simply to exhibit the contents of the Bible in a scientific form. His relation to the Scriptures is analogous to that of the man of science to nature. The business of the naturalist is to collect the facts belonging to his particular department. He is bound to collect them all, and to allow each its proper value. His success depends on his fidelity as to those two points. Then he has to observe the relation in which these facts naturally stand to each other; and thence deduce the laws which determine that relation. He is simply an interpreter. He cannot invent facts; he cannot ignore them; he cannot undervalue them; he cannot imagine laws or causes which control the facts which he observes. He must gather the laws from the facts, or they have no more scientific value than the fancies of a poet. This is the inductive method which has given science its firm foundation, and secured its wonderful triumph. Before this method was adopted, all was confusion and failure. Men presumed to determine à priori what matter was, what were its laws, how those laws must operate, and what must be the results. Their whole effort was to make the phenomena agree with their à priori theories. Facts therefore had to be overlooked, or distorted; and combined by a purely *ab extra* process of the mind. Tons of volumes, worm-eaten, and covered with cobwebs, are stored away, filled with these idle and now contemned speculations. Theology has had a similar fate. Thousands of books have been written showing what the truths of revelation ought to be, and must be made to be, in order to conform to the à priori principles of their writers. And these thousands of books are either already keeping company with the worm-eaten tons of speculative science, or are soon to be buried in similar receptacles of useless lumber. Dr. Bushnell has added another to these à priori disquisitions. He has formed a theory which pleases his imagination, and gratifies his feelings, and to this *per fas et nefas* the facts of the Bible must be made to conform. That this is a hopeless and a useless task is self-evident. "No man knows the things of God but the Spirit of God."

We must humbly receive what he has revealed, or remain in darkness.

Dr. Bushnell, for example, has his own idea of God, very different from the scriptural doctrine, and from this arbitrary conception of the Divine nature, he undertakes to determine what the acts and purposes of God must be. According to the Bible God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. Dr. Bushnell denies that he is a just being. That is, he denies that justice, in the established meaning of the word, is a virtue, and therefore denies that it is an attribute of God. But this is one of the facts of Divine revelation; just as clearly revealed and just as well authenticated, as that God is infinite or eternal. As this sentiment of justice is instinctive and indestructible in the constitution of our nature, Dr. Bushnell must persuade men to deny themselves, to deny a self-evident truth, before he can get them to adopt his idea of God, or to accept the conclusions which he draws from it.

He ignores the element of guilt in sin. Guilt is the relation of sin to justice. If there is no justice, there can be no guilt, as where there is no law there can be no transgression. Every sinner knows that he is subject to wrath; not merely to the natural consequences of his sin, as when he burns his hand, but to the righteous judgment of God; to the positive and intentional infliction of evil as the punishment of transgression. He knows that he deserves such infliction. He knows that it ought to be inflicted, and therefore he dreads it from the hands of a righteous God. This is an universal fact of consciousness, as well as one of the clearest facts of revelation. How dreadful it is for a man to devise a plan of salvation for himself and others, which ignores the fact of guilt; which denies the justice of God, who after all is, and will be found to be, a consuming fire.

Again, according to the Bible, God is infinite in power, governing all his creatures and all their actions; working all things after the counsel of his own will. Subject to no law out of himself; but is the law to all rational creatures. An absolute sovereign, not only as ruling according to his own will, but as being free from all limitation either actual or conceiv-

able. As he foresees and directs all things for the attainment of the highest ends, nothing can occur inconsistent with his purposes, and therefore nothing can be the cause to him of surprise, perturbation, or distress. Nothing can disturb his infinite tranquillity and blessedness; a blessedness which arises from the absolute perfection and harmony of his own nature, and the impossibility of anything occurring contrary to his infinitely wise and benevolent designs. Such is the scriptural doctrine concerning God, as understood and received by the Christian church. This is one of the great facts of the Bible which lie at the foundation of all sound theology. Dr. Bushnell's idea of God is very different from this. It must be different or he could not hold his peculiar theory. With him God is as much subject to law as any of his creatures. He speaks of him as bound to do this and to avoid that. He even conceives possible, although not actual, a state in which creatures owe no allegiance to God, but are subject, with their Maker, to a rule of right above both. According to the scriptural doctrine, the absolute reason cannot be irrational, or the absolute good be otherwise than good. That in the highest sense God is a law unto himself, and above all law other than his own nature; and therefore a law to all intelligent creatures. The will of God as the ground and rule of obligation to man, is not mere *arbitrium*. It is the expression of absolute reason, truth, and goodness, which constitute the nature of God as a personal being. And it is to that personal being, to reason, truth and goodness as personal in God, that the allegiance of all creatures is due. Dr. Bushnell concedes to Pantheists the principle on which their arguments against the personality of God and the possibility of his possessing moral character, depends. They say that moral character supposes conformity to law, and the possibility of want of conformity; but such subjection, and the possibility of being other than it is, is inconsistent with the nature of the absolute. Therefore God as absolute can neither be a person nor possess moral excellence.

Again, Dr. Bushnell limits God in another way. The scriptural doctrine is that God can do his pleasure among the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of earth; that all created minds are under his absolute control; that he turns them as

the rivers of water are turned; that without doing violence to their nature, or interfering with their free agency, he can govern all their thoughts and all their actions. This is the foundation of all natural, and of all revealed religion. It is the only rational ground of hope, or encouragement in prayer. All this Dr. Bushnell's theory denies. It assumes that free agents can be controlled only by moral power, by expression and impression; and that such control is necessarily limited. God strives to prevent sin; exerts all his power to recover sinners from their apostacy; is filled with anguish on their account and because they refuse to be restored to holiness. Now this not only degrades God as impotent in his government, taking the reins out of his hands, and placing them in the hands of creatures, who can at pleasure, one and all, run wild, and make sin and misery perpetual and universal, but it is contrary to the plainest facts of the Bible. God allowed the fallen angels to perish without redemption. If love, from its very nature, unmodified by justice, binds all good beings, created and uncreated, to vicarious sacrifice, to untiring and ceaseless effort to recover the lost, why are not fallen angels redeemed? or, why are the finally impenitent abandoned, as Dr. Bushnell admits they are, to hopeless and endless perdition? It is perfectly plain that the clearest facts of the Bible must be rejected, and its most precious truths denied to make way for this other gospel, which is not another, but the product of a vain imagination.

Again, every believer knows, and delights to acknowledge, that salvation is of grace; that God was not bound to provide redemption for fallen man; that Christ was under no obligation to assume our nature, suffer and die in our behalf; that not only the gift of Christ, but the knowledge of salvation, the means of grace, the mission and work of the Spirit, are all perfectly gratuitous; that God would have been as holy, as righteous, as good, had he allowed men to perish in their sins. This is perhaps the most luminous of all the truths of the Bible. It strikes every eye, even the weakest. It is acknowledged by every Christian heart. Its denial is pronounced by Paul to be a rejection of the gospel. Yet Dr. Bushnell's theory does deny it. Christ did nothing out of the way; he had no superla-

tive merit. He did no more than he was bound to do. This is asserted over and over. He did no more than God the Father has been doing from eternity (how so we do not understand); nothing more than the Holy Spirit is now doing; nothing more than every patriot, philanthropist, missionary or martyr, each in his measure, does, and is doing from day to day.

This remedial scheme, moreover, ignores the scriptural account of the natural state of man. It assumes that we are in a condition to be redeemed by moral power, by "expression," by the manifestation of goodness and greatness; a power which must be earned, analogous to the influence which great and good men exercise in moulding the character of their fellow-men. It is of course admitted that the moral power of the gospel is as great as such power can be made, or can be conceived of; that the plan of salvation contains such an exhibition of love, of self-sacrificing devotion, of moral grandeur and greatness, as fills the intelligent universe with astonishment, and which is to be throughout eternity the great means of revealing to all created minds the perfections of God, and consequently the great means of promoting the holiness and blessedness of all intelligent creatures. Nay more, it may safely be asserted that the love of God as exhibited in the gospel, is unspeakably greater, higher, grander, more wonderful, and powerful for good, than in the fancy-scheme as sketched by Dr. Bushnell. With him that love is nothing superlative, does nothing more than it was bound to do; it surmounted no obstacles; it is just what love in creatures is. It has nothing gratuitous, nothing mysterious in its nature; nothing to excite the amazement of angelic minds. To them, however, it was wonderful that God should love the unholy and spare the guilty. That is what they could not do, and what was to them, as to us the mystery of redeeming love. Compared to this, the love of which Dr. Bushnell speaks sinks to the level of an every day affair—manifested by every philanthropist and patriot. It is like changing a bridegroom's love for his bride into philanthropy; or a mother's love for her child into benevolence. But let that pass. What we have now to remark is, that his theory overlooks the nature of the

end to be accomplished; an end for which moral power, by itself, and in itself, has no adaptation. What could all the love or tenderness in the world accomplish for the redemption of a man under a righteous sentence of death? It could not reverse the sentence. It could not open the prison doors. It could not make it right that the criminal should be pardoned. Here again the great fact of Scripture and of human consciousness, that we are guilty, under a just sentence of condemnation, is in this scheme utterly ignored. A theory which makes no provision for anything but sanctification, which overlooks the necessity of pardon, or more properly of justification, is utterly unsuited to the known condition of sinners. It is also just as impotent for sanctification. What good can all the warmth and light in the world do a corpse? What effect has the love of God on devils? What influence had the love and holiness of Christ on his murderers? or, upon those now who are dead in trespasses and sins? Dr. Bushnell is like a skilful physician who should provide a rich abundance of food, and overlook the little circumstance that his patient was dead.

It need hardly be remarked in addition, that the theory of this book contradicts all those facts of Scripture and experience which prove that God is a sovereign in the distribution of his favours; that "he has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens." The love of God as revealed in the Bible and in history is not a principle which operates by a necessity of its nature, and with equal energy towards all the subjects of sin and misery. "I thank thee," says the tender and blessed Jesus himself, "that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." In point of fact God did not save the fallen angels. In point of fact he does not treat the Chinese as he does the inhabitants of Europe and America; nor the people of Italy and Spain as he does those of Protestant England and of the United States. The exercise of his love is determined by own will and wisdom; by his justice and righteousness. The believer is willing to leave all things in his hands, assured that he will do all things well, that in the end it will appear that the Judge of all the earth does right, however incompetent we may be to understand his ways.

It is intolerable that such an intellectual animalcule as man should sit in judgment on the infinite God, and lay down the law for Him, and decide he must do this and abstain from doing that. Our only business is to ascertain, from his word and providence, what he does do, and on the facts thus furnished construct our scheme of doctrine.

Dr. Bushnell's theory, as it ignores or denies some of the plainest facts of the Bible and the most articulate declarations of the common consciousness of men, so it is destructive of practical religion. If his doctrine be true there can be no conviction of sin. There may be a sense of pollution and degradation, but there can be no sense of guilt, no remorse of conscience, no apprehension of the wrath and curse of God; none of those feelings which arise from the apprehension of the glory of God's justice. Yet the Bible is filled with the record of those feelings; and all Christian experience, and, indeed, all religious experience include them as one of their most essential elements. Without the conviction of sin, as involving a sense of guilt, there can be no genuine repentance. Repentance is not only sorrow for sin and a purpose to forsake it, but an acknowledgment of our desert of punishment, and conviction that we lie at the mercy of God; that it would be just and right, consistent with all his perfections, to leave us to bear the penalty of our transgression. This is not a dictum. The Scriptures abound with evidence that repentance includes the conviction and acknowledgment that the penitent deserves, notwithstanding all his service and all his reformation, to be punished for his sins; that his acceptance by God is a matter purely of grace. The Psalmist says, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and clear when thou judgest." Our Lord puts the language of true repentance in the mouth of the prodigal son, who said, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thy hired servants." This sense of unworthiness, this conviction of ill-desert, after reformation and in despite of it, is expressed in all the supplications of repenting sinners for pardon. With Dr. Bushnell there is no pardon; any more than for a broken leg. With

him repentance is restoration to holiness, followed by deliverance from the natural evils of a sinful state of mind. It is mere restoration to health. God has nothing to forgive, and forgives nothing, any more than a mother forgives a sick child when she rejoices over its recovery.

Saving faith, or those acts of faith, which secure salvation, includes a receiving and resting upon Christ alone, as he is offered in the gospel. It is the recognition of him as God manifest in the flesh, obeying and dying for the sins of men. It is faith in his blood as an expiation for our offences; a resting upon his merits as the ground of our acceptance with God. It is receiving him not only as a prophet and king, but as a priest to make an atonement for our sins. This is not a transient act merely. It is an abiding state of the mind. It is a habitual relying upon Christ as the ground of pardon, as well as the source of sanctification and of all good, temporal and spiritual. This is the received doctrine of the Bible, inwrought into all the confessions, formulas of prayer and of praise, as well as into the hearts of God's people. It is their life. Sin, as they know, must be expiated, before they can be made holy. All this, Dr. Bushnell denies. Not indeed so much in words, as in reality. The Rationalists of Germany, while holding only the doctrines of natural religion, deliberately retained the use of all scriptural language and representation. They too talked of justification by faith, (meaning by it substantially what Dr. Bushnell does); they did not hesitate to say that Christ saves us; that he is the Lamb of God; that he bore our sins; that he is our high priest; that he makes intercession for us, &c. But the ideas attached by Christians to these words they utterly rejected. So Dr. Bushnell defends the use of the same or similar formulas in an esoteric sense. He is honest enough to admit that his views are very different from those commonly expressed by the same terms. He says he is well aware how insufficient his exposition of the great doctrine of justification by faith will appear to many. P. 439. With him, as we have seen, justification is inward renovation, and of which faith is the necessary condition; it is the receptivity, or susceptibility for the moral power of the gospel.

Of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, which is the

Protestant and Pauline doctrine, he confesses that calling it, "*articula stantis, vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, I could more easily see the church fall than believe it." P. 439. "We only speak," he says, "of justification by faith, as a new footing of salvation, because there is such a power obtained for God, by the human life and death of Christ, and the new enforcements of his doctrine, as begets a new sense of sin, provokes the sense of spiritual want, and, when trust is engaged, creates a new element of advantage and help, to bring the soul up into victory over itself and seal it as the heir of God. And thus it is, or in the sense thus qualified, that we speak of justification by faith, as the grand result of Christ's work, and the all-inclusive grace of his salvation." P. 405. The simple meaning of all this, in plain English, is, that Christ has made such an exhibition of the goodness and greatness of God, that those who recognize it are thereby strengthened to overcome sin, love God, and are thus delivered from all the evils naturally connected with a sinful state of mind. How sad a prospect the dying thief, or any other perishing sinner, must have had, if that is the way in which Christ saves us; if that be the meaning of justification by faith.

It follows, moreover, from the theory of this book that prayer has no objective power. If God is striving to the utmost, under the necessary operation of love, to convert and save all sinners; if this work is effected not by "fiat-power" but by expression, or moral influence, what is the use of praying that God would send his Spirit to regenerate or sanctify, or to do us any good? Dr. Bushnell is bold enough to ridicule the scriptural doctrine on this subject. "We have a way of saying," he tells us, "as regards successful prayer, that it *prevails with God.* Is it then our meaning that it turns God's mind, makes him better, more favorable, more inclined to bestow the things we seek? . . . . But the true conception is this—that God has instituted an economy of prayer to work on Christian souls and brotherhoods, and encouraging them to come and make suit to him, for the blessings they need;" and so on through a paragraph all tending to prove that the effect of prayer is purely subjective. P. 521. Was this the design of the prayers of Christ? Were they intended to get him "into

a state more configured to God," so that the Father could "be able to grant, or dispense, things which before he could not?" Was such the intent of the prayer of Elias when he prayed that it might not rain, and it rained not for three years? Is this the prayer of faith which heals the sick? or the effectual fervent prayer for others of a righteous man which availeth much? Is such the mother's prayer for her child, or the constant prayers of the people of God for the conversion of the impenitent?

It is not worth while to continue this review further. It is evident that Dr. Bushnell's theory is at variance with the plainest facts and truths of the Bible; with the facts of Christian experience, or the inward teachings of the Spirit as avouched by the inspired records and the whole history of the church; with the most obvious facts of providence as well as of revelation. It subverts the very foundations of evangelical religion as well as of Christian theology. And all for what? Simply because Dr. Bushnell does not like the idea of expiation. He says, it revolts him. As there is no expiation, there can be nothing in God which demands it—(no justice); nothing in sin, which requires it, (no guilt); nothing in Scripture which teaches it; no atoning sacrifice, only lustrations; no efficacy in Christ's blood beyond what belongs to the blood of martyrs; no judicial, or even rectoral justification; no intervention in our behalf possible even for God himself, but to operate on our guilty, depraved, dead souls, in the "way of expression." This surely is a costly sacrifice to make to propitiate an aversion.

Art. II.—*The Samaritans, Ancient and Modern.*

Nabulus, the Neapolis of ancient history, the Sychar of the New Testament, and the Shechem or Sichem of the Old, has from time immemorial been the residence of the Samaritans. They are, according to their own tradition, a remnant of the Ten Tribes of Israel, the only true Israelites, "to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." Hovering about the sacred mount of their fathers, they are guarding with zealous care the rites of the ancient people of God, as taught by their interpretation of the sacred books of the great lawgiver and leader of the children of Israel.

Let us accept these traditions of their fathers, and their own settled convictions respecting their origin, their religious rites, and their faith, and at once this strange religious sect are invested with wonderful interest. Of all religious sects they are the most extraordinary, the most ancient, the most venerable, and yet the most inconsiderable, the fewest, feeblest, in the world. They consist of some thirty families, and one hundred and thirty or forty souls. Among the countless millions of the human race, they are the only true worshippers of God, the sole depositaries of his revealed will. The fire that was kindled from heaven on the sacred altar of the Jews has long been extinguished. The light that, age after age, shone out upon the surrounding darkness from the holy mount at Jerusalem, has been quenched in endless night, but its latest illuminations linger still on the cliffs of Gerizim in the mountains of Samaria, a gleam of inextinguishable light. Clinging to these cliffs and steadfastly watching that heavenly light, these ancient Samaritans, as the chosen seed of Israel, are awaiting, in sure and certain expectation, the coming of the cheerful morn that shall yet arise on the dark and dreadful night that is still gathering around them. "We know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ; when he is come, he will tell us all things."

Nabulus consists essentially of one long narrow street run-

ning east and west through a wonderful cleft in the mountain, beneath the frowning heights of Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south. The Samaritans are clustered together in the south-west quarter of the town, under the beetling crags of Gerizim which rise several hundred feet above them. The approach to them is through a rude, dark, and narrow arched way. Here, nestling in a recess of the mountain, they dwell in comparative security, fast by their little synagogue, where they assemble for their customary devotions.

Several conflicting theories have been advanced respecting the origin and significance of the name of the Samaritans. They affirm that it is not a patrial from Samaria, but a derivative from שֹׁמְרִים, the Hebrew verb meaning *to watch, to guard, to keep.* Their name derived from this root accordingly designates them as the watchmen, the guardians, the conservators and keepers of the oracles of God. Epiphanius also ascribes to this term the same significance.* They assert that their appropriate appellation is, not that of Samaritans, but *Israelites*, the true Israel of God, in distinction from *the Jews*, descendants from Judah who have forsaken the religion of their fathers. All this vaunting of their own rectitude and hatred of the Jews is in perfect accordance with their own undoubted origin from the original revolt of the ten tribes under Rehoboam. Jeroboam, that arch-traitor and rebel, who made Israel to sin, took advantage of a dissatisfaction with the burdensome exactions of Solomon, which was prevalent among the tribes remote from Jerusalem, to foment the discontent, and place himself at the head of the malcontents. The policy of the leader of the revolting tribes was at once and for ever to "break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel;" by every means to sunder violently every tie of interest and religion that had united the tribes in a peaceful, prosperous union; and to call into action every hateful malignant passion and prejudice between the dissevered sections of the country. The enmity between the rival kingdoms of Judah and Israel at this time, was of a civil, not a religious character. The religion of both was the same. Religious feuds were at a later period intermingled.

* Απο τοῦ φύλακας αὐτους εἶναι τῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμιον Μωϋσέως διαταξεως. Adv. Hær. Lib. I.

Samaritan and Jew, became the antagonistic parties, the embodiment and expression of every hateful attribute of a common enemy. "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil," said the Jews to our Saviour, as an expression of their implacable disgust. The rending of the government, the worship of the golden calves at Bethel, and at Dan, with the introduction of other idolatrous rites, and the consecration of Gerizim as the holy mount, the place of their solemn assemblies instead of Moriah, the mountain of the Lord's house at Jerusalem, was enough to establish for ever the hostility between Jew and Samaritan. As of old "the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans," so now the latter neither eat nor drink, nor marry, nor associate with the Jews. This enmity, on the other hand, is fully reciprocated by the Jews towards the Samaritans.

It would be foreign from our purpose to sketch the history of the Samaritans, or glance at the strange vicissitudes by which they have been reduced to a feeble remnant of an ancient and powerful people, still abiding on their native soil after the lapse of thousands of years, in the faithful observance of the rites of their forefathers. Our inquiries are limited to their present condition, their domestic institutions, their religious belief and rites, with the conflicting theories of the learned respecting their origin.

When Dr. Robinson was at Nabulus in 1838, only *thirty* Samaritans paid taxes to the government; and their entire population was one hundred and fifty. To Dr. Wilson, a few years later, they gave the same estimate of their number. One of their most intelligent men informed us in 1857, that they then consisted of thirty families, comprising one hundred and thirty souls. Dr. Stanley, still later, reports one hundred and fifty-two as their entire number, nor has their population essentially varied from this data within the memory of man. Diminished and brought low through oppression, affliction and sorrow, this solitary remnant has sustained themselves with singular tenacity and uniformity.

The domestic institutions of the Samaritans are strictly Jewish. Their names, of either sex, are derived from the

ancient Scriptures, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Ishmael; Sarah, Rachel, Leah, Milcah, Hannah, &c. The family of their priesthood have descended from the tribe of Levi. All else are descendants from the sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh.

The prevailing costume of the sect is white, especially when they appear in public, in their religious assemblies, and on all festive occasions. Mohammedan bigotry, however, compels the men to wear red turbans. The habiliments of the women are conformed to the costume of the country, but some are permitted to wear ear-rings, because of such the golden calf was made.

Both sexes enter into the marriage relation at a very early age. The proposal of the bridegroom, or more frequently of his father, is made, not to the bride, but to her father; and a dowry from the bridegroom is an indispensable condition of the acceptance of the proposals. The marriage covenant of the bride and bridegroom is written out at great length, and witnessed with much solemnity as the covenant of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, according to the law of Moses. This is accompanied with the reading of prescribed portions of the law. The festivities of the occasion continue several days, and are concluded with an interchange of presents between the bridal parties and their friends.

Public thanksgivings are rendered on the Sabbath for the birth of a man-child, and the day is consecrated to this joyful occasion. The birth of a daughter is passed in silence, but the ceremonial purifications prescribed in the laws of Moses are carefully observed by the mother. The rite of circumcision is administered on the eighth day, according to the Mosaic ritual. Relatives and friends are in attendance, and the day is devoted to feasting and mutual congratulations. Everything commemorative of one's birth-day is scrupulously repudiated as a heathenish rite of the Pharaohs of Egypt. Gen. xl. 20.

The priest is on no occasion to come in contact with the dead; the people may themselves perform the last offices of affection to their friends; but by so doing subject themselves to the penance of ceremonial uncleanness according to the Levitical law on that subject. For this reason others, not of their sect,

are employed to perform the burial services for their dead. Various ablutions of the deceased are requisite preparatory to interment. The religious services of their funerals are protracted and diversified with the reading of several lessons from the Pentateuch, prayers, and the Song of the Angels, sung, according to their tradition, at the death of Aaron. No funeral is admissible on the Sabbath day. This is a joyful occasion, not in harmony with the burial of the dead. For some time the female friends and relatives of the deceased daily frequent his grave, and linger near throughout the day, reading from the Books of Moses passages relating to the dead, and singing their sacred elegies. For the accommodation of these mourning women suitable apartments have been erected in their cemetery. On the Sabbath following the funeral the whole congregation, after morning prayers, gather about the grave and partake of a simple meal, after the manner of a love feast of the ancient church.

In their religion the Samaritans are monotheists of the straitest sect. No pictorial representation, in the likeness of any thing "that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath," is admissible by them; not even the portrait of a friend.

They admit the existence of good and evil angels; of heaven and of hell, the abode, after death, of the righteous and of the wicked. They look for a future judgment when soul and body will be reunited, and each will be happy or miserable according to his character in this life. But their views of a future state seem not to be clearly defined.

Like the Jews, the Samaritans are still waiting for the coming of Messias, for which they have in their Scriptures one only prophecy—"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." Deut. xviii. 15. Shiloh (Gen. xlix. 10) is not Messias but Solomon, according to their interpretation.

The coming of Messias will be six thousand years from the creation of the world. Their redemption is drawing nigh. He will quickly come and gather all nations to himself. On Gerizim will be his throne of universal dominion. The twelve stones on which the ten commandments were written by Joshua will

be recovered; together with the sacred vessels of the temple and the pot of manna, now buried under what the Samaritans denominate the stone of Bethel, also on their sacred mount. Then again will be established in its primitive purity the worship of the only living and true God, as now observed by them.

The seventh day of the week, the Sabbath of the Samaritans, is observed with all the strictness of the Levitical law. At the setting of the sun, on the day of preparation, each household retires within, suspending all labour, and closing the door against every intruder. No fire is kindled on the Sabbath, nor the slightest preparation made for their customary meals. We were in attendance at their public worship in their synagogue. The services consisted in liturgical, responsive prayers, chants, and rehearsals of their law, with kneeling, bowing, and prostrations, all apparently with the hurried heartless formality of an outward form, without the inward spirit of devotion. As the Mohammedan, in every place, turns in prayer towards the shrine of the prophet, so the Samaritan in his devotions never fails to look and to bow towards his holy mount. From the dust of this mountain Adam was formed. On it Adam, Seth, and Noah, successively erected their altars, and Abraham offered his son Isaac. Here the throne of judgment shall be set, and the Messias will reign from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth.

The great day of atonement is observed by the Samaritans with the severest strictness and solemnity. During the entire twenty-four hours they neither allow themselves to eat, or drink, or sleep, nor indulge in conversation. Silent meditation and the reading of their Scriptures are the appropriate solemnities of the day.

The feast of Pentecost, of Tabernacles, and of the Passover, are solemnized by processions to their holy mountain. But the Passover is the great occasion for their sacred solemnities. On the day preceding, before the setting of the sun, the whole congregation, men, women, and children, are encamped on Mount Gerizim. Six lambs, without spot or blemish, are provided for the sacrifice; the fires are kindled; and a deep pit prepared for the roasting of the victims. At the setting of the sun, the

congregation, gathered around the sacrifical fires, arrayed in white robes, engage in a liturgical chant of prayers and sacred songs, with the whole history of the plagues of Egypt and the appointment of the Passover, during which the lambs are led apart for the slaughter, the young men designated for this service brandishing aloft their long bright knives. At the words, "The whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening," (Ex. xii. 6,) the lambs are stretched lifeless on the ground, their blood streaming from them, the head having been almost severed from the body by one convulsive stroke of the knife.

Dipping their fingers in the blood, these officials cross themselves on the forehead and nose, a rite formerly observed by the whole congregation. The recitation is continued while bitter herbs are handed around wrapped in strips of unleavened bread. "With bitter herbs they shall eat it." Exod. xii. 8. In the meantime the lambs are fleeced by pouring boiling water over them, without flaying them. The entrails and the right fore-legs are cast into the fire; the liver, carefully washed, is returned to its place. The lambs, fastened on long poles as spits, are supported by these over the glowing coals in the pit, over which a hurdle is placed, and covered with wet grass and earth, so as to seal up the oven until the roasting shall be completed. "They shall eat the flesh in the night, roast with fire. Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire." Exod. xii. 8, 9.

Two hours have been occupied with these ceremonials, the shades of evening have gathered fast and deepened into night; the stars have come out, and the Paschal moon throws her pale silver light over these strange scenes on the sacred mount. The congregation retire to rest in their tents, passing several hours in solemn stillness. At midnight announcement is made that the feast is about to begin. The men gather eagerly around the pit, rehearsing their prayers while the covering is thrown off, and a vast column of steam arises up where

> "Smokes on Gerizim's Mount,
> Samaria's sacrifice."

The lambs are laid upon mats prepared for the purpose, each

by itself, and "his head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof" (Exod. xii. 9) between two lines of men standing with shoes on their feet, staves in their hands, and ropes round their waists: "Thus shall ye eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand." Exod. xii. 11.

The recitations suddenly cease, each with his fingers tears away the flesh by piecemeals, and eats in rapid eagerness and silence: "Ye shall eat it in haste; it is the Lord's passover." Portions of the flesh are carried to the women in their tents. The bones and the fragments are thrown into a fire kindled for the purpose, and the ground diligently searched with candles for every fragment of the consecrated elements to be thrown into the burning mass. "Ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that which remaineth of it until the morning ye shall burn with fire."

The remaining hours of the night are passed in prayer, and at early dawn the whole community descend from the mountain to their usual habitations in town. "Thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents." Deut. xvi. 7.

Thus on this sacred mountain in Samaria the Paschal Lamb is offered year after year—the only Jewish sacrifice that still lingers in the world. But it is worthy of remark that the Samaritans have not the remotest idea of the expiatory nature of any sacrifice, or of the remission of sin by the shedding of blood.

The sacred Scriptures of the Samaritans are the five books of Moses. This is in perfect accordance with their traditions, which date their origin, as a distinct sect, from the revolt of the ten tribes. At that period the Psalms of David, the writings of Solomon, and other portions of our sacred canon, must have been extant, but only the writings of Moses, embodied in the Pentateuch, may have been canonized and universally recognized as divine. These accordingly would be retained, cherished, and preserved by devout Israelites in the revolted tribes; and through all the vicissitudes of their eventful history may have been transmitted down to their latest posterity in the lineage of the Samaritans.

The knowledge and worship of the true God, we must believe

was never wholly obliterated by the idolatries of Israel. Great reformers from time to time arose in Judah and Israel to restore and retain the knowledge of God, and to perpetuate his word and his worship among the apostate tribes of Israel. The reformations under Joash, Hezekiah, and Josiah, extended into the tribes of Israel. At a period of deepest declension, in the time of Elijah and Elisha, there was a school of the prophets at Bethel. One hundred were saved alive by Obadiah when Jezebel sought to exterminate from the land the prophets of the Lord. 1 Kings xviii. 4. Under many of the kings of Israel the Lord raised prophets who exercised their office among the ten tribes. Under Nadab, Jehu the son of Hanani was prophet; under Ahab, Elijah and Micaiah; under Ahaziah, Elijah, Micaiah and Elisha; under Joram, Jehu, Jehoahaz, and Joash, Elisha. Jeroboam, the second, made extensive conquests by which he extended his territory from Hamath to the Dead Sea, "according to the word of the Lord God, which he spoke by the hand of his servant Jonah, the son of Amittai." 2 Kings xiv. 25. Under his reign, Hosea and Amos lived and prophesied in Israel. Now had all these prophets of Israel no copy of the laws of Moses, no standard to which they could appeal to enforce their reproofs or commands? Elijah and Elisha, at the head of the schools, had they no knowledge of the Pentateuch? Read their prophecies, notice their references and appeals to the Pentateuch, and who can doubt that this portion of the sacred oracles was preserved and known in Israel, throughout all the apostacy and captivity of the ten tribes. This series of prophets of Israel, from Ahijah under Jeroboam to Hosea and Amos and Oded under Pekah, 2 Chron. xxviii. 9, extends over almost the entire period from the revolt to the captivity of the ten tribes.

In the great reformation under Josiah over the region of the ten tribes, Jeremiah was contemporary with him, coöperating in this reform. His prophetic office continued through the reign of all the successors of Josiah into the Babylonish captivity. Urijah and several of the minor prophets exercised their office within the same period. And Ezekiel, before Jeremiah ceased his labours, received his commission to oppose the "rebellious house," the people of "stubborn front and hard heart" to

whom he was sent. Many of the ten tribes returned from captivity with those of Judah, and received the instructions of the prophets and reformers of that age. Numerous and unquestionable are the proofs that the knowledge of God, of his word and of his worship, was preserved in the tribes of Israel, not only during the whole of their existence as a separate nation, but throughout their captivity, until their admixture with the foreign residents in their native land under the name of Samaritans, who adopted their sacred books, their faith, and their forms of worship.*

"The Lord testified against Israel and against Judah by all the prophets, and by all the seers, saying, 'Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep my commandments and my statutes according to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets.'" They would not hearken, indeed, and rejected his statutes. Such was the general character of the people, but were there no exceptions? none that set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel? none of the true Israel of God who walked still in the statutes of the Lord? The prophet Elijah thought himself left alone in Israel, a solitary worshipper of the only living and true God, when there were found seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal.

Antiochus Epiphanes pillaged and profaned the temple at Jerusalem, desecrated by every abomination its most holy rites, burned the sacred books, forbade the people under pains of death, to retain or read them; and appointed overseers throughout the land who perpetrated the most terrible atrocities in the execution of his decrees, subjecting to torture, crucifixion, and death in every form, those who observed the commandments, or preserved the Books of the Law. But the effect was that the law was preserved with greater care, cherished with deeper affection, embodied in the sacred canon, and delivered unimpaired to future generations. 1 *Maccab.* i. 50—64, *Joseph. Antiq.* xii. 5, *Tacit. Hist.* v. 8.

Even in the archives of his idolatrous ancestors king Josiah

* Compare on this subject North Am. Rev. vol. xxii. New Series xiii., pp. 274—317, by Professor Stuart.

found a neglected copy of the Book of the Law. Such vitality has this incorruptible seed, when once it has taken root, that in climate and soil the most uncongenial and forbidding, it can never be wholly extirpated.

Neither could the people, all, without exception, have been carried into captivity. No record in the Scriptures represents a universal conquest of the tribes. Naphtali was in the line of the invading army and several of her cities were taken, once and again. 1 Kings xv. 20; 2 Kings xv. 29. On one occasion the invaders returned through the country east of the Jordan. 1 Chron. v. 26. In the third invasion Samaria was captured. 2 Kings xvii. Include under this head Ephraim and Benjamin. Even then Asher, Zebulon, Issachar, and Dan, remain exempt, except so far as the enemy may have passed through some of their borders. The entire depopulation of such a country as Palestine moreover is an impossibility. Its strongholds, mountains, caves, and deserts, offer means of concealment and defence invincible by any force. The children of Israel never gained possession of the whole land, nor extirpated the original inhabitants. What motive could the conqueror have to burden his returning army and his country with the aged, the young, the infirm, the helpless, useless consumers, who would only prey upon its production. However desolate the land, many more must have escaped from the spoiler than went into captivity. And among these remained devout Israelites not a few who still adhered to the religion of their fathers.*

They that went into captivity, moreover, would carry secretly with them their Bible; and some would inevitably find their way back to their own native land. The sure word of prophecy had foretold this return: "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel shall gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock." Jer. xxxi. 10. "And I will gather them out of Assyria, and I will bring them into the land of Gilead [Bashan] and Lebanon; and place [sufficient] shall not be found for them." Zech. x. 10. "And there shall be a highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria;

* Compare Davidson's Connexion of Sacred and Profane History. Vol. i. page 35.

like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt." Isaiah xi. 16.

Such, we believe—all theory, speculation, and learned disquisitions apart—are the obvious deductions of common sense; and such are the declarations of authentic history. In this belief we contemplate the Samaritan Pentateuch as a venerable document that has come down to us from the remotest antiquity. In the line of the revolted tribes and of the Samaritans the Pentateuch must have come down to us. Biblical scholars of vast erudition and research, such as Eichhorn and others, have conclusively inferred the great antiquity of the Hebrew Pentateuch from the Samaritan copy of it. We are not ignorant of theories, more of them anon; but at present leave us to the undisturbed conviction of the venerable antiquity of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Their own undoubted belief indeed severely tasks the most indulgent credulity. With great solemnity they reluctantly exhibit to the traveller the original copy of the sacred scroll written by Abishua, the son of Phinehas, and great-grandson of Aaron! Credat Judæus Apella. Non ego. The real age of this manuscript will probably never be determined, but it has beyond doubt just claims to a high antiquity. Our party obtained from one of the sect two sheets of an imperfect copy of their Pentateuch. These are written on parchment with great beauty and precision, in the Hebrew language, but in the old Samaritan character. They have been submitted to the critical examination of another more competent to describe these fragments of the Samaritan Pentateuch, as to the character and critical importance of this venerable document. To him the reader is indebted for the following paragraphs on this subject.

"The following description of two specimen leaves of the Samaritan Pentateuch purchased at Nabulus, may afford some idea of their sacred manuscripts. They are of folio size, containing Num. xxxi. 21—xxxii. 4, and xxxiii. 4—xxxiv. 4, written in a clear, legible character, of remarkable neatness and regularity. Exactness in the length of lines is secured by separating their initial and final letters from the words to which they belong, an arrangement which presents to the eye the appearance of a narrow border. There is also a noticeable

liking for alliteration. Various devices are used to bring the same letters or words in vertical juxtaposition in successive lines, the most striking instance of which is in the record of the journeyings of the children of Israel, xxxiii. 10—48, where the page has quite a tabular look. Individual words are separated by a single dot; the verses, which for the most part correspond with the Masoretic, by two dots vertically placed. Occasionally the main pause in the verse, which the Masorites indicated by the accent Athnahh, is also marked by two dots placed either vertically or horizontally. Sections generally, though not uniformly agreeing with the lesser Jewish Parashahs, are also noted by dots and spaces.

"The variations from the ordinary Hebrew text exhibited upon these pages, like those of the Samaritan Pentateuch generally, are of four sorts, orthographical, grammatical, critical, and those which are of the nature of glosses. Two or three manifest slips of the pen in the transposition of letters are not reckoned; nor two or three additional instances in which letters or words were unintentionally omitted, which have been supplied in smaller characters above the line or in the margin. The orthographic variations are confined to the vowel letters, the *scriptio plena*, occurring forty times in this brief compass, where the common Hebrew text has the *scriptio defectiva;* the reverse takes place in but four instances. In a few proper names also, Yodh is substituted for Vav, making a change analogous to that of Huram, 2 Chron. ii. 3, for Hiram, 1 Kings v. 2. The grammatical variations are such as the regular insertion of the conjunction *and* between the particulars of an enumeration as xxxi. 22, or a change of gender or number, the more usual construction being preferred to that which is less so, or the omission of the article where it is unessential. The critical emendations, or what seem to have been intended as such, introduce a more exact conformity to some parallel passage, as in xxxi. 28, 'of all manner of beasts,' is added as in verse 30. The glosses are first the simple substitution of one equivalent word for another, this being confined in these pages to the interchange which twice occurs of one preposition for another of the same meaning; and secondly, the insertion of words, or even sentences, to make the sense plainer or more forcible. Thus the word

'all,' is inserted before 'the inhabitants of the land,' xxxiii. 55, which seems to be a peculiarity of this manuscript, as it is not found in the Samaritan Pentateuch as printed in Walton's Polyglot. The word 'so,' however, inserted before 'I shall do,' in xxxiii. 56, is found in Walton, as are the greater portion of the variations above described, and as is also the most remarkable gloss of all, which is now to be mentioned. In Num. xxxi. 21—24, Eleazer, the priest, utters a command which the Lord had given to Moses, but it is nowhere stated that Moses had charged Eleazer so to do. The Samaritan Pentateuch accordingly supplies this imaginary omission by introducing the following paragraph: 'And Moses said to Eleazer the priest, Say unto the men of war which went to the battle, This is the ordinance of the law which the Lord has commanded. Only the gold and the silver and the iron, and the tin and the lead, everything that may abide the fire, ye shall make to go through the fire, and it shall be clean; nevertheless it shall be purified with the water of separation; and all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make go through the water. And ye shall wash your clothes on the seventh day, and ye shall be clean, and afterward ye shall come into the camp.' "

The Samaritan Pentateuch may be of little importance as a codex for the revision of the original text; but if we may accept the alleged authorities for its great antiquity and venerable character, it becomes a remnant of antiquity of great interest as a duplicate copy of the Pentateuch that has come down to us through the long line of three thousand years. Judah and Israel, Jews and Samaritans, have been each the depositaries of this portion of the sacred canon, guarding with wakeful jealousy their own codex of the Law as divine, and rejecting as spurious and worthless that of the other. But after the lapse of many centuries these ancient copies are found, on comparison, to be essentially the same,—one and the same book divine, transmitted down to us from the remotest period of recorded time through separate and independent channels, and still harmonizing in all the essential revelations of the ordinances and statutes of the Lord God of Israel. The argument for the authenticity, genuineness, and antiquity of the four Books of Moses, carries us back through these converging lines of light

up to a thousand years before the Christian era. They were extant at that distant age—received as canonical, divine, by opposing sects, who have severally transmitted them down to us as an authentic and venerable transcript of the Book of the Law as originally given by the Lord to Moses on Sinai. How many elaborate theories and learned discussions would be given to the winds by the discovery of two authentic copies of Homer's epics, preserved separate and entire, from the distant age of this famous Grecian bard? How much learned criticism and controversy would be settled by the universal acceptance of the authenticity of the Samaritan Pentateuch!

But for two hundred years the authenticity of this Book of the Law has been held in earnest controversy. And even by common consent of the learned, sanctioned by the high authority of Gesenius, Hengstenberg, and others, disowned and rejected as spurious and worthless.

The theory is, 1. That our own canonical Pentateuch is not the production of Moses, the leader of the children of Israel, but of some unknown author who lived a thousand years later, about the time of the Babylonish captivity. Such at least is the position of Gesenius, who, during a long life devoted to the study of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, never lost an opportunity of casting contempt upon their inspiration, miraculous character, and divine authority.

2. That when the ten tribes were carried away captive into Assyria, the cities and villages of Samaria were not merely partially but wholly depopulated, so that the whole land was left utterly desolate, without an inhabitant, until "the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel; and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof." 2 Kings xvii. 24.

3. That these Assyrian foreigners, a medley of many nations and various forms of idolatry, took the name of Samaritans from the name of the country to which they were removed, and became the head of the Samaritan sect.

4. That these idolatrous Samaritans abandoned their false forms of religion, through the influence of the judgments of

heaven, and of a priest sent back to them from the land of their captivity, and adopted the religion of the Jews, mixed with certain foreign rites.

5. That the rejection of Sanballat's proposal to assist in rebuilding the temple, after the Babylonish captivity, confirmed the natural hostility between the Jews and Samaritans; and that the latter adopted the Hebrew Pentateuch, with certain modifications, as their own sacred code, and established on Gerizim a schismatical form of worship, expressive of a perversion of the religion of the Jews, sanctioned by a spurious copy of the Mosaic Pentateuch.

We have neither the ability nor the presumption to open anew this controversy, but we must protest against this series of assumptions, all and single, as, in our judgment unsatisfactory, untenable, and illusive, notwithstanding the high authority with which they are promenaded, and the ability with which they are defended.

Confiding in the antiquity, genuineness, authenticity, inspiration, and Divine authority of the Mosaic Pentateuch, we pass without remark the skeptical theory of Gesenius, the great neologist of Germany; but cannot forbear the expression of our regret that others of sounder faith, and more worthy of confidence, should lend their influence, directly or indirectly, to the support of assumptions so derogatory to the sacred Scriptures.

The theory that when Israel was carried away, the country was wholly evacuated, the aged, the young, the infirm, men, women, and children being carried into captivity, is in the highest degree improbable, not to say impossible. Neither is it foretold by prophecy, nor authorized in history, sacred or profane. Of the prophecies foretelling the desolation of Israel, we do not recall any so severe, so sweeping, so expressive of utter extermination as those which the Lord spake by his servants against Judah and Jerusalem: "Behold, I am bringing such evil upon Jerusalem and Judah, that whosoever heareth of it, both his ears shall tingle. And I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab, and I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it, and turning it upside down." 2 Kings xxi. 12, 13. But it stands recorded as an

historical fact, notwithstanding, that the poor of the land were left to be vinedressers and husbandmen. Is not the inference conclusive, that the same was true of Samaria in her deepest desolation?

Moreover, the prophetic promise is to Israel as well as to Judah, of a remnant that should return from captivity to their native land. In addition to passages cited above, note the following: "Lo, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah; and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers." Jer. xxx. 3. "And I will bring Israel again to his habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied upon mount Ephraim and Gilead." Jer. l. 19. Is this indicative of the utter extermination of Israel in Samaria, the original stock of the Samaritans?

History records many instances of the conquest of a land by a foreign foe, and of the people carried into captivity. A single city, or village, or petty province, may in consequence have been entirely deserted. But we have yet to learn of an instance within the range of history, of a numerous people over an extensive territory swept utterly away, and the land lying desolate, without an inhabitant for a century or an age. Even from the bloodiest massacres in city, citadel, or fortress, some have survived to tell the story of the carnage.

The history of the kings of Judah, subsequent to the capture of the ten tribes by the siege of Samaria, until the Babylonish captivity, distinctly implies the presence of a remnant of inhabitants still in that waste, desolate land. Josiah, in this interval, destroyed the altar and the high place which Jeroboam the son of Nebat had set up at Bethel. He broke down the altars and images of Baalim, and "burnt the bones of the priests upon their altars, and cleansed Judah; and so did he in the cities of Manasseh, and Ephraim, and Simeon, even unto Naphtali," the remotest of the tribes of Israel, 2 Kings xxiii. 15, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6, and finally died in battle at Megiddo in the centre of the tribes of Israel. Must we, can we believe that at this time the whole land of Israel was lying desolate without an inhabitant? Further, to repair the house of the Lord, the Levites, at this very time, "gathered

of the hand of *Manasseh* and *Ephraim*, and of *all the remnant of Israel*, and of all Judah and Benjamin." 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9. This specification of Judah and Benjamin most distinctly indicates that the preceding contributions were gathered from the remnant of the ten tribes of Israel who still lingered in the land, adherents to the religion of their fathers, numerous and flourishing enough to give substantial aid in repairing the temple at Jerusalem. As an instance of similar contributions from Israel, compare the forty-first chapter of Jeremiah.

Before the reign of Josiah, the king of Assyria may have "brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel; and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof." 2 Kings xvii. 24. The learned have proposed various theories respecting the date of the settlement of these colonists in Samaria. The most probable conjecture, perhaps, is that they settled in the land at different times from various countries, bringing with them the strange gods and idolatrous rites to which they had been addicted in their native land. The zeal of Josiah may have been directed against their idolatries, but the *contributions* for the restoration of the temple and its religious rites must have been made by devout Israelites remaining in their cities and tribes. The effect of the prevalent idolatries of their invaders, the scorn, contempt and persecution to which they, as the outcasts of Israel, were subject, would be only to bind them more closely to the religion of their fathers, to the law and the testimony of their sacred books.

Next, the theory under consideration presents us with the strange spectacle of a motley herd of polytheists and idolaters forsaking their false gods for the worship of the only living and true God; and receiving and cherishing, with profoundest reverence, the sacred books of their bitterest enemies; adopting the religion of the sect whom they regarded with the most implacable hostility; and that, without political interest present or prospective, without intellectual culture, without development in art or civilization, without religious instruction, save from one ignorant priest sent back from captivity to teach them "the manner of the God of the land." Verily this strange

conversion contradicts all history, and transcends all belief. It reverses the usual process of development and progress of the human race. It supposes a development from ignorance, idolatry, and sin, upwards towards God; whereas the historic fact is, that the development of the race has ever been downward, not upward. No nation or people, brutalized by idolatry and sin, have ever lifted themselves, by their own moral instincts, out of their condition.

"The earliest authentic record that we have, shows that man began his existence pure and holy; that he had knowledge of but one God, the Creator and Sovereign; that the golden age was at the beginning, which he lost by sin; that then the Divine Being was worshipped by sacrifices, each man being a priest; that afterwards the race deteriorated to such an extent that they were swept away by the retributive justice of the Almighty."*

Within four hundred years from the flood, the iniquity of the Canaanites was full. Sunk in sin, they were ripe for the destruction to which they were devoted. They give place to the father of the faithful and his posterity, that secluded from surrounding wickedness by special ordinances, by local position, and the retired pursuits of pastoral life, they might perpetuate on earth the knowledge and worship of God. The whole earth had already apostatized from Him. The entire history of the Jews is a record of their continual degeneracy, which all their providential discipline, and divine instruction, coupled with the combined influence of prophets, priests, and kings, could only occasionally stay for a time, but never effectually resist. The progress of the select seed of Abraham was only downward, in deeper apostacy from God. Have then this medley of Assyrian idolaters cast away their idols in a day, in utter abhorrence of every image or symbol in religious worship, and returned back to God contrary to the course of the whole human race?

Why the adoption of the *Pentateuch* alone as their sacred code of laws and book divine? With one or two exceptions perhaps, the roll of prophecy was complete. If not embodied

* Voices of the Soul, p. 198.

in the canon, it was entire in its several parts. Why all are rejected except those from the hand of the great Jewish lawgiver, this theory of the exclusive origin of the Samaritans from a mixed race of foreign idolaters, fails to explain; and this failure does but expose the more its fallacy.

The Samaritans, on proposing to Zerubbabel and "the chief of the fathers" to unite with them in rebuilding the temple, urge the consideration that their faith and forms of worship are the same as those of the Jews. "Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon king of Assur, which brought us up hither." Ezra iv. 2. Whatever may have been the motive of the Samaritans in making the proposal, with what show of truth or plausibility could they make this declaration on the theory that they had not yet received from the Jews their books pertaining to the Mosaic ritual?

In every particular the theory under consideration is, in our judgment, fallacious, contradictory to history and to the progress of the whole human race in their continual apostacy from God. We marvel at the general acceptance of a theory so preposterous by men of learning and piety. We marvel at the readiness with which even the wise, the learned, the good, follow their leaders; and whirl into rank and file under their literary chieftains.

Foremost among these dictators of popular sentiment, Gesenius* and Hengstenberg† are the acknowledged champions of the learned for the defence of the theory under consideration. The latter has entered upon an elaborate and learned argument to prove, what none can doubt, that when the Samaritans became known and took their place in history as a distinct sect, they were essentially a community of foreigners, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. The ten tribes had gone into captivity. Their land, waste and desolate, had been occupied many years by foreign colonists who were the origin and the founders of the Samaritan sect. Hengstenberg's argu-

* De Pentateuchi Samaritani, origine, indole et auctoritate. Commentatio philologico-critica.

† Beiträge 2te Band. Das Samaritanische Exemplar, und das Vorhandseyn des Pentateuchs im Reiche Israel.

ment accordingly is but a waste of words to prove an historical postulate granted without argument—that the Samaritans as known at the return of the Jews from captivity, were essentially of foreign origin. A nation is known by its rulers. These are its public representatives. But the country is at this time, and has been for almost two hundred years, a foreign province. The officers of state are foreigners. Ezra iv. 7—11. The Samaritans, therefore, as a nation, sect, or people, are collectively of foreign extraction. And the laboured discussion of Hengstenberg only ends in a fact admitted from the beginning.

But the real question at issue is, whether the Samaritans were *purely* a collection of foreigners commingled and blended together in a new religious sect, or whether there was from the beginning a remnant of the children of Israel, who, assimilating with these foreign immigrants, became an integral and influential part of the sect of the Samaritans. This we cannot doubt; and respectfully submit that this theory offers a reasonable explanation of the strange admixture of foreign elements in the Jewish forms of the religion of the Samaritans. The revolt under Rehoboam began with an effort, to which the Jews had ever been addicted, to assimilate their religion with that of other nations. The revolted tribes professed, not to abjure the worship of Jehovah, but to worship him under a new form, in the image of the golden calves. "They set up images and groves in every high hill, and then they burnt incense in all the high places as did the heathen," while professing still to worship the God of Israel.

On the other hand, the idolatrous immigrants were disposed to conform to "the manner of the God of the land," and called from captivity a Jewish priest "to teach them how they should fear the Lord." And yet while seeking to conform to the religion of the Israelites, their captives, these foreign colonists, were not divorced from their false gods. They only sought to blend their own religion with that of the country of their adoption—Paganism with Judaism. "So these nations feared the Lord, and served their graven images; both their children and their children's children." Comp. 2 Kings xvii. 24—41. The result was a corrupt form of Judaism to which they that were

only Jews outwardly would readily conform, while devout Jews would inwardly cherish their national religion, and secretly conform, as best they could, to its sacred rites. Mixed marriages and family alliances with foreigners was the natural result of this coalition; which became a snare to the Jews who returned from the Babylonish captivity. Scandals, in consequence arose, which all the authority, energy, and decision of Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah could but imperfectly correct. These stern reformers saw, in the general degeneracy, reasons sufficient and imperative for steadfastly refusing all proposals from the Samaritans of a confederacy with them. "Let us build with you, for we seek your God as ye do," was the persistent proposal of the Samaritans. "Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel. "Ye have no portion nor right, nor memorial in Jerusalem." Ezra iv. 3; Neh. ii. 20.

The same proposal Sanballat subsequently renews to Nehemiah. What is his motive? As satrap, or governor of the province, he sees the importance of attaching these powerful caravans of colonists to his government as a means of increasing its population and resources. Defeated in these designs by the decision of Nehemiah, his policy is by every expedient to prevent the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the rise of a rival power in his neighbourhood. Conflicting interests, rivalries, jealousies, and feuds, political and religious, enkindle anew ancient animosities, and establish for ever the mutual hatred of Jews and Samaritans.

The mutual relations of these sects at the conclusion of the Babylonish captivity, together with their rivalries, jealousies, and conflicts, resulting from the return of the Jews to repair the desolations of Jerusalem and rebuild their temple, have been sketched with a skilful hand by Juynboll,* to whose delineations on this vexed subject we respectfully request a careful attention, as briefly expressed in the following paragraphs.

Many of the Jews had at this time abated much of their former hostility towards the Samaritans, which subsequently became so rancorous and so universal. Their own depressed

* Commentarii in Historiam Gentis Samaritanæ.

condition had constrained many to seek alliances with the Samaritans as a relief from present and impending evils. At home and abroad they had become familiar with foreigners, and yielding their own exclusive prejudices with their religious scruples, had learned to tolerate foreign customs and habits, in so far that men of Tyre dwelt with them in the midst of Jerusalem, and habitually profaned the Sabbath day by their public markets, and all manner of secular employments. Neh. xiii. 15, 16. With the Samaritans, especially on their borders, they lived on terms of familiar social intercourse. Both the men of Judah (Ezra ii. 25—28, compare Neh. vii. 29 seq.), and men of Israel (Ezra ii. 59), and Benjamites, returning from captivity, dwelt in their cities with those who had previously taken up their residence in them. Neh. xi. 31. Living thus with Samaritans and other foreigners in many cities, the Jews became daily more assimilated to them; and many, not only of the common people, but of their princes and their priests, became connected with them in marriage. Ezra x. 10; Neh. vi. 17, 18, xiii. 23, seq.; Mal. ii. 10—16. Certain of the Levites who had been rejected from the priesthood on failing to establish their genealogy, joined themselves to the Samaritans. Ezra ii. 61—63; Neh. vii. 63—65.

These again were, at this time, favourably disposed towards the religious rites of the Jews. Many under both Ezra and Nehemiah united with the Jews in keeping their feasts at Jerusalem. The children of Israel, an integral part of the Samaritans, were present at the dedication of the temple, and a special "offering, on their account, of twelve he-goats" was made on that occasion "according to the number of the tribes of Israel." Ezra vi. 17.

The Israelitish judaizing Samaritans not only recognized the temple and the city of Jerusalem as a sacred place, but in deference to her prophets and priests sought their counsel in regard to their religious rites; of which we have a remarkable example in the seventh chapter of Zechariah. In the fourth year of king Darius, after the dedication of the temple, *Bethel*, one of the cities of the Samaritans, sends a delegation to Jerusalem "to pray before the Lord," and to enquire of the "priests" and the "prophets" whether the fast commemora-

tive of the *destruction* of the temple should be discontinued, since it had been rebuilt and consecrated to the worship of Jehovah? The Divine reply which the prophet is directed to give to this delegation comprehends the seventh and eighth chapters of Zechariah.* In this connection the alliance of Eliashib the priest, with Tobiah, a Samaritan from a foreign nation, and his entertainment in a chamber in the courts of the house of God, Neh. xiii. 4—7; and the marriage of one of the sons of Joiada with a daughter of Sanballat, should be carefully noted as indicative of the affiliation of Jews and Samaritans at this time.

But there was also another party, composed of Priests and Levites, who had returned from their captivity to reassert their former prerogatives and power, together with devout Jews who truly loved their nation, their country, and their ancient religion. These, regarding with abhorrence the temporizing policy and lax morals of the native residents, zealously united their influence to reëstablish the religion of their fathers, to correct abuses, to rebuke the scandals of the times, and reform the habits of their demoralized countrymen.

Under these circumstances, the policy of Sanballat, as governor of the province, is at first altogether conciliatory towards those immigrants who came in powerful caravans to settle in Jerusalem and the deserted cities of Judea. He proposes to encourage and aid them in rebuilding the city and temple of Jerusalem, on condition that all should build together in promotion of a common cause, which would increase the population and advance the various interests of his province. Failing in this policy, by the stern refusal of the Jews to build with him, to acknowledge his authority, or accept any terms of confederacy, civil or religious, with him, his next effort is by every means to counterwork the designs of the Jews at Jerusalem. By ridicule, Neh. iv. 2, by slander and false representations at the Persian court, Ezra iv. 4, seq.; by private assassination, Neh. vi. 1—14; by open war, Neh. iv. 8. Sanballat in connection with "the people of the land weakened the hands of

* Such is the interpretation which our author, in common with Hitzig Ewald, and Henderson, gives to this vexed passage, Zech. vii. 1, seq.

the people of Judah, and troubled them in building." Ezra iv. 4. Here arose again, with tenfold virulence, the "irrepressible conflict" between Jews and Samaritans, which soon matured into that mutual intolerance, bigotry, and implacable hatred, which subsists between them unto this day.*

But the Samaritans of Shechem, that remnant of Israel, weak and small, lingering around their sacred mountain like a little flock of kids on their native cliffs—what, in the mysterious providence of God, awaits them? Where is "the everlasting love" with which He has loved them? Jer. xxxi. 3. Has his covenant with them for "a thousand generations" expired? Is prophecy a failure? Has its trumpet given an uncertain sound relating to the dispersed of Israel? Will they never be gathered? Will the envy of Ephraim never depart, nor Judah ever cease to vex Ephraim? "Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them unto their own land: and will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations; neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 22. Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said: "The morning cometh, and also the night." Has then the night come on which no day will ever arise to the lost tribes of Israel? or is a cheerful morning dawning on the prophetic vision of the seer?

"Watchman! does its beauteous ray
Aught of hope or joy foretell?"

The names of Sychar, Sichem, Shechem, of which Nabulus is the representative, are endeared to us by sacred scriptural associations, as well as by charming natural scenery. In the lofty precipitous crags which overhang the quiet, verdant valley below, the grand, the sublime, the beautiful, are exquisitely blended. The verdant valley extending through this wild cleft in the mountain, the silver stream, the fountains and rills on either side which run among the gardens and groves of

* Compare Prideaux's Connections, part i. b. vi.

olives, figs, pomegranates, and all kinds of fruits, the flocks reposing on the mountain slopes, the shepherd's pipe, the song of the bulbûl, and the merry notes of thousands of singing birds—all combine to lend enchantment to this exquisite vale of Shechem.

Here the father of the faithful first halted, on entering the promised land, and erected its first altar to the God of Abraham. Jacob, returning from his fatherland, set up here his altar to the God of his fathers, purchased the parcel of ground for his son Joseph, whom he loved so tenderly; and sunk his well, the waters whereof he drank, and his children, and his cattle. On these grounds his sons were tending their flocks, while forming their conspiracy against the innocent, unsuspecting victim of their cruel jealousy. Joseph, enthroned in power in Egypt, refused the tombs of the Pharaohs for a lone grave here in his own parcel of ground in this sequestered vale, apart from the sepulchre of his fathers.

High above, on the lofty heights of Ebal and Gerizim, by the command of Moses to Joshua, the twelve tribes of Israel, six on Ebal, six on Gerizim, assembled to avouch the Lord Jehovah to be their God; and to read and ratify the law which he had given to them on Sinai, while the tribe of Levi, with their elders, officers and judges, were standing in the deep valley below, around the ark of the covenant of the Lord. There the tribes read alternately the blessings and the curses connected with obedience and disbbedience, as Ebal and Gerizim echo back responsively to each other the loud Amen of the tribes; while from the tribe of Levi, around the ark, arises up again their solemn Amen. So let it be ever more, world without end—the blessing of God upon obedience to his law; on disobedience, his curse. Beyond comparison the most august assembly that was ever gathered, the most impressive scene ever enacted by man on earth.

In commemoration of this covenant, the law was then written out on pillars of stone erected on Gerizim, that the children of Israel might "fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD."

From these cliffs, "in the top of mount Gerizim," Jotham delivered to the men of Shechem, far below him, his parable in

reproof of their folly in making Abimelech their king, "and ran away and fled" before the enraged Shechemites could reach these inaccessible heights by the laborious, circuitous route by which they are still ascended.

These sacred scenes have been consecrated yet again by the presence of the Saviour, in the instructive incidents of his conversation with the woman of Samaria at the mouth of Jacob's well. At the base of the mountain, where the vale of Shechem opens out from the pass, between Ebal and Gerizim, Jesus seats himself by the side of the well at midday, faint and weary, as the traveller still halts, in quiet contemplation amidst the hallowed associations of the scene. His disciples pass up the gorge to the city to buy bread for their midday meal. The woman of Samaria comes down in the mean time to draw water, and the conversation proceeds which the beloved disciple has detailed with inimitable simplicity and force. John iv. 1—43. Above them rises the sacred mountain, crowned by the ruins still remaining of the temple, where, according to the fathers of the Samaritans, men ought to worship, while Jesus informs the wondering woman: "The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship Him." But these Samaritans are blinded still as to the character and coming of Messias; "for to this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament." In their blindness they still worship, as their fathers did, "in this mountain," in vain expectation of the coming of Messias, "which is called Christ," not knowing that at his coming, "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

ART. III.—*The Great Schools of England:* an Account of the Foundation and Discipline of the Chief Seminaries of Learning in England. By HOWARD STRATTON. London, 1865.

ENGLAND has no corporate establishments more remarkable than her two grand old universities, and her great collegiate schools. Most of them were the offspring of medieval times, and the birth of some of them belongs to a period so distant from our own, that the most laborious antiquaries have not been able, with certainty, to fix their date. But far back in the Middle Ages as that date may carry us, we have every reason to believe that academic life which was then called into being, has flowed onward through the centuries, in a continuous and unbroken stream, from that day till now. Italy and France could once boast of universities, which had become famous seats of learning long before Oxford and Cambridge existed, of which indeed the latter were copies, but amid the revolutions of continental Europe these most ancient institutions have been destroyed, or radically changed.

At the present day, no country in Europe possesses educational institutions of any sort, which are the copy or the counterpart of the universities, or of the collegiate schools of England. These schools and universities so peculiar in their organization, as well as venerable for their antiquity, though quite independent of each other, are still in various ways interconnected, and have many features in common. Both schools and universities have ever been, and probably are still, the noted seats of the most intense and immobile conservatism, so called. Hence time has made comparatively little change in their corporate constitution, social economy, usages, even in the costume of their members, and their modes of teaching. The striking lines addressed to one of them, by one of the most accomplished jurists and statesmen of England, Sir Roundel Palmer, may be applied to all of them.

> Four hundred years and seventy-one, their rolling course have sped,
> Since the first serge-clad scholar to Wykeham's feet was led;

> And still his seventy faithful boys, in these presumptuous days,
> Learn the old truth, speak the old words, tread in the ancient ways;
> Still for their daily orisons resounds the matin chime,—
> Still link'd in holy brotherhood, St. Catherine's steep they climb;
> Still to their Sabbath worship they troop by Wykeham's tomb—
> Still in the summer twilight sing their sweet song of home.

But earnestly as they have clung to the past, and stoutly as they have for the most part resisted everything that wore the garb of innovation, they have been compelled to yield to the progressive spirit of the present, and reform has, at last, effected an entrance within their sacred and well-guarded precincts. It was high time that such an invasion should be made, and we have no doubt that ere long persons of all shades of opinion and feeling, even those who have been most clamorous in asserting that "things as they are, are just as they ought to be," will confess that the triumph of reform was most desirable for the sake of these venerable institutions themselves, as well as the coming generations of English youth. For long years the condition of some of the most splendid colleges of Oxford, and some of the grandest of the Great Schools of England has shown how completely the spirit of an ancient charter may be lost, while its letter is maintained with pharisaic scrupulosity, and how ingeniously the generous purposes and magnificent gifts of the large-hearted men of other days have been perverted, or defeated by the very parties who enjoy their benefactions and profess to idolize their memory. No intelligent person can doubt that the founders of these colleges and schools, who built palatial residences for their members, and endowed them with princely revenues, intended to open fountains of learning, to which the youth of England should have free access; and that even the restrictions by which some of their foundations were hedged around, originated in no narrow spirit, but were designed to meet some manifest exigency of their times. But however far short these Great Schools may have come of the ideal of their founders, it must be owned that all connected with them may look with no little pride on their past history, for on the rolls of their alumni will be found the names of those, who, during the last three centuries, have been most illustrious among the statesmen and the scholars of England.

Our readers, of course, are familiar with the names of Winchester, Eton, Rugby, Harrow, and of other great schools of England, but many of them, we dare say, have little knowledge of their history, of their peculiar constitution, and of the points in which they resemble and differ from the colleges and academies of our own country. The volume before us contains the most complete and satisfactory account of these schools that we have met with, but as it is not probable that it will be republished here, we propose to give our readers the substance of it. The subject, let us here say, is one not simply of historical interest, but is worthy the attention of all who are concerned with the business of education, and is well fitted to stimulate those among us who possess abundant wealth, to devote a portion of it to the service of coming generations. From the history of these great schools of England, it will be seen that they are not, as many imagine, national establishments, founded and endowed by the church or the state, at the public expense, but that most of them owe their origin wholly to individual munificence. The memory of such men deserve to be held in perpetual remembrance. Dead for many centuries, they still live and speak in their noble works. Their benedictions are as affluent and effective now as they ever were; and in such an age as ours, with its immense material enterprise, and the ever-growing demand of the millions for intellectual and moral culture, such examples of benevolence and beneficence may be very properly pointed out to our princely merchants and other men of wealth, as worthy of their study and imitation.

In our notices of these great schools we shall take them in their historical order.

Winchester was founded in 1373 by William of Wykeham, at that time Bishop of Winchester, as well as one of the ablest and most influential statesmen of his day. His father is said to have been a yeoman or small farmer, though his mother was of gentler blood, and the son seems to have inherited the shrewd sense and aptness for business of one parent, and the refined tastes of the other. Though he had not the advantages of a learned education, he evinced at the early age of twenty-three

such rare talent as an architect and engineer, that he was employed to erect numerous fortifications on the southern coast of England, and to repair and alter the castles of Winchester and Windsor. The latter now appears nearly as he left it. So well did he acquit himself in these occupations, that he won the special regards of the king, and various dignitaries, civil and ecclesiastical.

In 1366, Wykeham was raised to the see of Winchester, and was also made Lord Chancellor, though he resigned the latter office in 1371. When nominated to the bishopric, some of the older prelates reproached him for his want of scholarship. He is said to have made to these objectors the following truly noble reply:—"I am unworthy, but wherein I am wanting myself, that will I supply by a brood of more scholars than all the prelates of England ever showed." The boast proved not to be an empty one.

His college at Winchester was established in 1373, but the splendid structure designed to be the home of his scholars was not completed until 1393; meanwhile he had prepared the way for the erection of one at Oxford, which was to be the complement of that at Winchester, and in 1380 he laid the foundation-stone of "Sainte Marie College of Wynchestre in Oxenford," which took and has ever since borne the name of New College, and is one of the richest and most magnificent in that city of colleges.

Wykeham lived many years after the completion of his two colleges, and enjoyed the rare and supreme delight of seeing them increase in fame, and bring forth those good fruits for which he had founded them.

Of the buildings devoted to collegiate purposes, with their quaint and quiet quadrangles and cloisters, their spacious halls, refectories, common rooms, libraries, chapels with "storied windows richly dight," all of them in the highest style of Gothic architecture, and surrounded by velvety lawns and exquisite gardens, it is not easy to give an untravelled American an exact idea. In a word, they form *un tout ensemble*, on which the eye of no one with scholarly tastes can look, without feeling Milton's wish awakened in his heart—

"But let my due feet never fail
To walk the studious cloisters pale
And love the high unbowed roof,
With antic pillars many proof,
And storied windows richly dight
Casting a dim religious light."

This is true of all the older English colleges, and a more befitting home cannot be imagined for the quiet student and thinker in which to ponder the mysteries of nature and philosophy. From time to time grateful "Wykamists" have enlarged or added to the original buildings. One of these is the School, a so-called "modern structure," though erected in 1687. It is a spacious and finely proportioned room, the walls of which are adorned with the armorial bearings of nobles, prelates, and others who contributed to the building, and also with various symbols designed to excite the ambition, or the fears of the young scholars, such as, a mitre and crozier to represent clerical learning, a pen, ink-horn, and sword, as the insignia of civil and military pursuits, and *a long Winton rod*, typical of the punishment awaiting the indolent. Under each emblem is the appropriate legend, "*Aut disce*,"—"*Aut discede*,"—"*Manet sors tortia cædi!*" which has been jocosely rendered

"Study hard, or else be jogging
Or you'll get a plaguy flogging."

Wykeham made provision for a warden, ten fellows, seventy scholars, a head-master, an under-master, three chaplains, three clerks, and sixteen choristers. In 1857 the constitution of the college was modified by the University Commission, and hereafter it is to consist of a warden, six fellows, one hundred scholars, twenty exhibitioners, the old number of chaplains, clerks, and choristers, remaining the same as formerly. The warden is the official head of the college, and he and the fellows are the trustees, having the entire charge of the collegiate property. They take no part in the work of instruction, yet their incomes are very handsome, that of the warden being £1700 besides an elegant residence, while each fellow gets £550. In one view these offices may be said to be sinecures, but in another they are not, since being prizes won by faithful service

in the school, or by distinction in literature and science, the youngest boy in the college feels their stimulating influence. But the most lucrative and important office is that of the head master, now held by the Rev. Dr. Moberly, one of the most intelligent and successful educators in England. He is practically at the head of the college, and his income amounts to £3000 a year.

The scholars, distinctively so called, are the boys "on the foundation," now numbering one hundred, who are boarded and taught without cost. All the restrictions once connected with the appointment of scholarships have been removed since 1857, and they are henceforth to be open to the free competition of boys, no matter where they may have been born. The expense incurred by the "commoners" or non-foundation boys is £116 per annum. The course of study extends through five years, and the great incentive to diligence in past years was the hope of gaining one of the seventy Fellowships in New College, Oxford, to which Winchester scholars alone were eligible. Henceforth these prizes, as well as others which have been established by various benefactors of later times, are to be open to students of all classes, who have spent one or two years at this school. Down to a quite recent date the curriculum at Winchester was almost exclusively classical, the rising of a boy in school rank depending entirely upon his classical attainments. Until within a few years, with the exception of arithmetic, a boy could learn nothing there but Greek and Latin, and during the greater part of the last century there is reason to believe that the instruction given was as inefficient as it was defective. De Quincey, in his "Life and Manners," mentions that in his boyhood he was attended by Dr. Mapleton, a physician of Bath, who had sent three sons to Winchester, but who had removed them from thence in consequence of that venerable abomination, *fagging*, which still retains its place in many of the great schools of England. The quick eye of the father detected symptoms of declining health in his boys, and on cross-questioning them, he discovered that being *fags* to certain seniors, they were obliged to go out nightly into the town to execute commissions, which was not an easy task, as all the ordinary outlets were closed about nine o'clock. In such a

dilemma, any route, that was merely practicable, at whatever risk, must be traversed by the loyal fag, and it so happened that none of any kind remained open or accessible, except one, and this one happened to have escaped suspicion, simply because it lay through a succession of no less than seventeen cloacinal temples. Through all their mephitic morasses these miserable yet loyal young fags had to thread their way almost every night in the week. The father finding, that even under such circumstances, *faggery* was an abuse too venerable and sacred to be touched, removed his sons from the school—the one sole accomplishment which they carried away from Winchester being a knowledge of the Ziph language.*

During the last twenty years, Winchester, in common with most of the other collegiate schools, has greatly improved in discipline, and in the subjects and methods of instruction. The course of study is still largely classical, but it also embraces mathematics, history, natural science, and the modern languages, which form an essential part of the curriculum, being studied by all the pupils during the entire period of five years.

Eton College was founded in 1440 by Henry VI., one of the most pious and most unfortunate of English monarchs, and was dedicated by him to the "Blessid Marie of Etone beside Wyndsore." It was built at a time when the peculiar force of the Middle Ages was becoming exhausted, and like its older sister Winchester, it has never lost its mediæval and monastic aspect. It has been said of Eton College that "it is eminently a poetical institution." Certainly, its position under the shadow of the grandest of the royal castles of England, and on the banks of the largest of English rivers, is such as a poet would love to describe. The exquisite lines of Gray "on a distant prospect of Eton," will at once recur to our readers.

> "Ye distant spires, ye antique towers,
> That crown the watery glade,
> Where grateful Science still adores
> Her Henry's holy shade;

* This Ziph language seems to have been invented by the Winchester boys centuries ago, for the purpose of privately communicating with each other in company. It was described by Bishop Wilkins in 1665, who speaks of it then as ancient, and it is explained by De Quincey. *Life and Manners*, p. 78.

And ye that from the stately brow
Of Windsor's heights the expanse below
Of grove, of lawn, of mead survey,
Whose turf, whose shade, whose flowers among
Wanders the hoary Thames along
His silver winding way,
Ah! happy hills! ah, pleasing shade!"

Perhaps from the fact of its being the erection of a monarch (out of his own private property, however), Eton ran great risks of being despoiled if not destroyed. Henry VIII. had actually taken steps towards the confiscation of its revenues, but his death saved the college from spoliation, and from that day to this, its history has strikingly illustrated the appropriateness of its motto, "floreat Etona," as it has continued to grow in wealth and influence, and is now one of the richest scholastic establishments in the world. The collegiate edifice consists mainly of two quadrangles, made up of chapel, library, schools, dormitories, master's chambers, residences of fellows, and altogether has quite a monastic aspect. Indeed, it looks as if one of the many magnificent establishments of Oxford, which is only about a dozen miles distant, had some how floated away from its ancient moorings.

As originally founded by Henry VI. provision was made in the college for only twenty-five scholars, but, probably through the influence of Waynflete, who was called from Winchester to be its first head, it ultimately consisted of a provost, a head master, a lower master, ten fellows, seventy scholars, ten chaplains, ten clerks, sixteen choristers, and thirteen alms or bedesmen. Since 1857 the constituent body is formed of a provost, a head, and a lower master, seven fellows, seventy scholars, three chaplains, twelve choristers, ten lay clerks, and ten almswomen, who act as servants, and take the place of the ancient bedesmen. The office of Provost of Eton is one of the most highly coveted academic dignities in the kingdom. Lord Bacon, when he ceased to be Lord Chancellor, petitioned for it, and from time to time it has been held by some of the most renowned scholars of England. The provost has a noble mansion and a salary of £2000 per annum, while each of the fellows has a house or lodgings in the college, and £700 per annum. As at Winchester, so here, they have nothing to do directly with the work of

education, but are the trustees of the college, and have the entire management of its vast property. The income of the head master, who has also a house within the college, amounts to £4572, and is derived mainly from the fees paid by pupils; that of the lower master is about half that sum.

The seventy scholars on the foundation were formerly called "Collegers," but are now known as "King's Scholars," the name having been given to them by George III. They are chosen by the provost, vice-provost, head master of Eton, the provost and two fellows of King's College, Cambridge, appointed annually for the purpose. According to the original statutes, their qualifications are, that they be "*Pauperes et Indigentes*, apt for study, of good morals, skilled in reading, plain song, and grammar." No one can be elected who is under eight or over twelve, unless, being under seventeen, he has made a certain measure of progress. They were to be provided with every thing needful for their education, food, lodging, and dress. But for many years, and until within a comparatively short period, the noble design of the founder was defeated by a shameful perversion of their trust on the part of the provost and fellows, who almost entirely monopolized themselves, the vastly augmented revenues of the college. As a consequence of this perversion, the scholars for whom the institution was specially intended, were so grossly neglected, that parents would not send their sons to the college, and it often happened that the number of foundationers or king's scholars did not amount to fifty, while the cost of their education was not much less than that of other pupils.

Within the last twenty years, however, these evils have been to a great extent corrected. A scholarship is now gained, not as formerly by nomination, but through a competitive examination open to all comers, and the consequence is, that the "king's scholars" are the *élite* of the college. They now get their education, board and lodging, free, or nearly so; the quarters of the seniors, especially, are much more comfortable than in past years; and then one of the greatest incentives to exertion is the hope of winning a scholarship and fellowship in King's College, Cambridge, which bears to Eton the same relation that New College, Oxford, does to Winchester.

The students not "on the foundation" bear the name of "Oppidans," so called from the fact of their residing outside of the college proper. At present they number seven hundred, making the whole number of Etonians about seven hundred and seventy. For more than three centuries Eton has been, as it still is, preëminently the aristocratic school of England, and has educated a larger number of the youthful nobility and gentry of the three kingdoms than all the other great schools put together.

Its scholastic arrangements are so much more complicated than those which obtain in our classical schools, being partly those of an academy and partly those of a college, that it would not be possible to give our readers a complete and accurate idea of them without devoting to the subject much more space than we can spare. First of all, there are the upper and the lower schools. The seven hundred and seventy students attending them are arranged, according to a time-honoured plan, into six forms, three for the upper and three for the lower schools, but as these have grown to be too large to be handled by a single master, without disturbing this arrangement, the whole mass has been distributed into twenty-two divisions, viz., seventeen for the upper and five for the lower. As a rule, no boy is admitted to the upper school after he is fourteen; nor can he enter without passing an examination by no means rigid, consisting of translations from Greek and Latin into English, and from English into Latin prose and verse. The lower school is open to boys of any age who can read. Formerly, the ancient languages formed the almost exclusive subject of study in Eton as in other great schools, but now, the course is a much more liberal one, though not equal to that of Winchester. Each pupil is required to have his own personal tutor, who aids him in preparing the lessons of the day, out of school, or who, to use a university term, is his "coach." This usage appears to have grown up by degrees to supplement the scanty instruction which the boy received in the school-room, and it now has the force of law. Hence, if a boy is inclined to be indolent, he can be so and still make a respectable appearance in the class-room, while if he has a taste for learning, and is ambitious of winning the magnificent prizes of academic life, he has all the

help he could desire. This private tutorial usage has, of late years, had the happy effect of inducing all the better class of boys to engage in what is called "private business," and which consists of a considerable amount of reading, independent of the school work, on subjects chosen by the tutor. A studious Etonian will thus have read, under the guidance of an accomplished scholar, some of the finest productions of ancient or modern literature, besides having had the advantage of the training of the schoolroom, by the time he is prepared to proceed to Oxford or Cambridge. Eton, however, is not alone in the encouragement given to her pupils to enter upon a course of voluntary work, or "private business," as the same thing is done in all the English and Scottish schools of the highest order.

Although there is no formal system of physical education at Eton, nor at any other great school, although Gymnasia under that name are things unknown, this most important branch of education is by no means neglected. The boys manage that matter in their own way, yet with the decided approval of their teachers. Of course, cricket holds a high place among Etonian sports, as it does among those of all other schools in England, but as the Thames is so near at hand, rowing is the supreme pastime. The captain of the boats is the greatest man in the school, and next to him stands the captain of "the Eleven." The weekly races by the various boat clubs, and the annual procession of the boats on the river, on the 4th of June, are sights worth seeing. And one of the most intelligent of the masters, who has taken an active interest in the physical education of the Eton boys, bears emphatic testimony to the fact, that their keen participation in athletic sports is productive of very beneficial effects, moral as well as physical. In his judgment, it diminishes the class of idlers and loiterers, to whom too many temptations are presented in the little shops of Eton, and is at the same time an antidote to luxurious habits, to drinking, and to vice of all sorts. To guard against accidents, no boy is allowed to go on the river, who has not "passed" in swimming before a committee of masters.

There is one old Etonian custom which was at once a pastime and a sort of solemn ceremony, dating from an unknown

antiquity, which, although now a thing of the past and not of the present, deserves a brief notice—*The Triennial Ad Montem*. On the Tuesday in Whitsun week, (about the 20th of May,) the whole school was wont to march to an eminence known as "Salt Hill," bearing two banners, one emblazoned with the arms of the college, the other with the motto, *Pro More et Monte*. Here, the boys forming the procession dined together, joined in a Latin prayer, and then returned in the order in which they set out. What the original design of the ceremony may have been is uncertain, but for many years its object was to collect contributions from the crowds of spectators who came to witness the gay scene, among whom were usually some members of the royal family, and great numbers of the nobility and gentry, and personal friends of the boys. The two chief collectors or "Salt-bearers," as they were styled, were a Colleger, and an Oppidan; they were arrayed in splendid dresses, carried a silken bag for donations, and, assisted by other boys in similar dresses, they ranged the country in all directions, exacting tribute, or "salt," from all whom they met. The sum collected on these occasions sometimes exceeded £1000; the half of it went to defray the expenses of the festival, and the other half was given to the Senior Colleger, who was the captain and hero of the day, as his outfit for the university. The introduction of railway travel, however, soon changed the character of Montem, as it gave facilities for crowds of "fellows of the baser sort" to gather there for their own evil purposes, and at length their excesses became so scandalous, and beyond control, that the only alternative was the abolition of the custom, which was done in 1847.

It only remains to add, that extensive as are the buildings of the college proper, they hardly suffice for the suitable accommodation of the seventy Foundation scholars. The seven hundred Oppidans reside in boarding-houses kept by the assistant masters, and by gentlemen and ladies who are in no other way connected with the institution. There are thirty of these boarding-houses, in all of which, as well as in the college chapel, there are morning and evening prayers.

St. Paul's, London, was founded in 1509, by Dr. John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, and on various accounts a truly remarkable

man. He was the son and heir of Sir Henry Colet, a wealthy citizen, and twice Lord Mayor of London. Dr. John Colet was the eldest of twenty-two children, and he alone remained to inherit the family estates. Erasmus, in a letter of condolence to his friend Amerbach, who had lost a daughter, refers to this prolific matron. "I knew in England," says he, "the mother of John Colet, a woman of singular piety, who had by the same husband eleven sons and as many daughters, all of whom were snatched away from her, except her eldest son. She herself being come up to her ninetieth year, looked so smooth, and was so cheerful that you would think she had never shed a tear, nor brought a child into the world; and, if I mistake not, she survived her son, Dean Colet. That which supplied her with so much fortitude was not learning, but piety towards God."

Dean Colet was born in London in 1466. He obtained his first education in St. Anthony's parish school, one of high repute in those days and long afterwards, and numbering among its alumni such men as Sir Thomas More, and Archbishops Heath and Whitgift. He removed to Oxford in 1483, and entered Magdalen about a year before his college companion Wolsey took his degree as "the boy bachelor." Colet was a most diligent student, and warmly sympathized with the new life which was then beginning to show itself in the domain of religion and of letters. Having acquired, says Antony Wood, "a most admirable competence in learning at home," he resolved to go abroad in order to enlarge his knowledge; he spent several years in France and Italy, where he made himself a thorough master of the Greek language, and formed an intimate friendship with the most distinguished continental scholars. With his fine talents so richly cultured, his pleasing manners, his wealth, and family connections, Colet might have hoped to win some of the highest prizes of political life; but he seems to have been from his youth a truly religious person, without, however, the least tendency to asceticism. Accordingly he entered the church, in which, unlike most of the ecclesiastics of his day, he did not seek the preferments which were conferred upon him, but accepted them simply because

they supplied the means of accomplishing noble purposes and plans for the good of others.

In 1505, Colet was made Dean of St. Paul's, London, on account of his rare learning and worth. He at once addressed himself to the dangerous task of reforming the lax discipline of the cathedral, denouncing those corruptions prevalent in every department of the church, against which the mighty voice of Luther was so soon to be heard speaking in thunder tones, and, of course, he soon stirred up a nest of hornets. He was charged with various heresies, such as opposition to image-worship—contending that the words addressed to Peter, *Feed my sheep*, had no carnal meaning—preaching against the idle disquisitions which the priests delivered under the name of sermons. His real sin, in the eyes of his bigoted bishop, and persecutor, Fitz James of London, being his habit of reading the Epistles of Paul in the hearing of the people. The Dean defeated the malevolence of the prelate, though Latimer says, in one of his sermons, "that he would have been burnt, if God had not turned the king's heart to the contrary." Instead of dying as a martyr, he was happily spared to become a pattern of learning, and the founder of a seminary which is still training hundreds of youth, and promises to flourish for centuries to come.

About 1509, the first year of Henry VIII., Colet erected suitable buildings for "the school of St. Paul," at a cost of £4500; he endowed it with an income of nearly £150—a large sum for those days*—which has already increased to £12,000 per annum, with the prospect of a further and enormous augmentation; and he drew up a body of statutes for its government, in which, with a noble and unusual catholicity, he declares that it shall be open to "the children of all nations and countries indifferently." The number of children attending the school was *one hundred and fifty-three*, this particular figure having been suggested, as Fuller in his Church History supposes, by the number of fishes caught by Peter in the miraculous draught. None were to be admitted but such as

* An ox could then be bought for six shillings, a sheep for one shilling, a capon for two-pence, and a quarter of malt for three shillings and four-pence.

could say their catechism, and read and write "competently." Each child paid four-pence on his first admission, which sum was to be given to the "poor scholar" who swept the school and kept the seats clean. This trifling sum was the only charge to which the scholars were liable, so that St. Paul's was the first really free school in England, and it has remained such to this day.

The government, or the trusteeship of St. Paul's, was vested by Colet in one of the great civic companies of London, viz., the Mercers. When asked his reason, he is reported to have said, "That there was no absolute certainty in human affairs, but, for his part, he found less corruption in such a body of citizens than in any other order or degree of mankind." The absolute power with which he clothed the Mercers' Company over the school, even to the extent of modifying his own statutes, is the best evidence of his entire confidence in their integrity and wisdom.

The work of instruction is carried on by the high master and six assistants. The stipend of the high master is £1000, and a residence. The three classical assistants also have residences, and salaries varying from £400 to £300. The school is divided into two departments, viz., the classical, which is subdivided into eight classes, and the mathematical. Provision is made for the instruction of all the pupils in French, and it is proposed hereafter to include German, Italian, music, and drawing. In proportion to its numbers, no school is more richly endowed with exhibitions and prizes than St. Paul's, there being no less than sixteen scholarships in various colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, with incomes varying from £120 to £10, besides gold medals and books.

Westminster was founded in 1560 by Queen Elizabeth, who, however, only carried out the plans and purposes of her father, Henry VIII., when the monastry of St. Peter's was abolished by him, and its property surrendered. Elizabeth caused the statutes to be drawn up by which the school has been governed ever since, and she also ordered the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, annually to elect to their scholarships as many youths as possible from Westminster school, in memory of her father's benefactions to that magnificent college;

but this injunction has long been a dead letter, happily for Trinity College.

As the maintenance of this school is a charge upon the funds anciently belonging to the Abbey, the supervision of it is vested in the dean and chapter. Like most of the other schools, it consists of two departments, or rather of two classes of scholars, those on the foundation, who are known as Queen's scholars, forty in number, and those not on it, who are known as Town boys. The former reside in the college, and are now wholly maintained at the expense of the chapter, the latter reside with their parents, who defray the entire cost of their education, which amounts to about £95 per annum. The head master, whose income is above £1000 per annum, is aided by three classical, three mathematical, and one French assistant. The classical assistants have salaries varying from £600 to £300, and, like the head master, they are also furnished with houses, and derive a large income from boarders.

Merchant Taylors, London. This school was founded about 1560 by the "Company of the Marchaunt Taylors," one of the most ancient and honourable of the London Companies; a society, says Stow, which had a guild from time immemorial, its fellowship having been *confirmed* so far back as the days of Edward I., and which displays upon its roll of membership ten kings of England, four foreign sovereigns and princes, dukes, earls, barons, prelates, and distinguished men in various walks of life, almost innumerable.

Like so many others in England, this seminary had its origin in individual munificence. Mr. Richard Hills, a leading member of the company, gave a sum, in the present day equal to £3000, for the purchase of a part of the "Manor of the Rose," or Pultney's Inn, as it was sometimes called,—a spot made famous for all time by Shakespeare's allusion to it in the first act of Henry VIII.:

> "The duke, being at the Rose, within the parish
> St. Laurence Poultney, did of me demand
> What was the speech among the Londoners
> Concerning the French journey."

Prompted by this generous offer, the Company of Merchant

Taylors bought the half of this property, in 1560 or '61, and at once organized the school which bears this name. Not long ago the company purchased the remainder of the estate, at a cost of £20,000, so that now the whole of the old and renowned Manor of the Rose is occupied by the school. The statutes were copied from those of St. Paul's, and the Merchant Taylors seem to have caught the catholic spirit of good Dean Colet, for, with a noble liberality, they ordained that the scholars should be "of all nations and countries indifferently." Their number was limited to two hundred and fifty. Six years after it was established, Merchant Taylors' School, at a single bound, took its place among the first public seminaries, or the great schools of the kingdom, through the princely benefaction of Sir Thomas White, one of the members of the company. This event occurred in 1566. A few years before, Sir Thomas had founded St. John's College at Oxford, and he now came forward and munificently appropriated forty-three fellowships of that college to the scholars of Merchant Taylors. With such lucrative prizes at command, the school rapidly grew in popularity, and the stipulated number of pupils was soon complete. The boys elected to St. John's were probationary fellows for three years, and then if found qualified in learning and morals, they became fellows for life. In 1861, however, by an ordinance of the Privy Council, the fellowships of St. John's were reduced to eighteen, and thrown open to all candidates, the remainder of the college funds being appropriated to the maintenance of twenty-one Merchant Taylor scholars, and to twelve open scholarships.

The course of study in this school, almost from its foundation, embraced Hebrew, the classics, writing, and arithmetic. Since 1829, mathematics, French, modern history, and drawing have been added. In order to admission, a boy must be at least nine years old, must be able to read and write tolerably, and have learned the "accidence" in Latin grammar, the principal facts in early Scripture history, and the catechism. He is placed in a classical form suited to his age and attainments, and he rises from one form to another according to his diligence and proficiency. Hardly one-fourth of the scholars proceed to the university, and in order to adapt the instruction

to the line of life for which the great mass of them are intended, the company have resolved to enlarge the course of education by introducing a system of mercantile tuition.

Originally the statutes ordained that one hundred boys should be admitted without any payment whatever; but at the present time each scholar pays £3 on entrance, and £10 annually for tuition, besides a small sum when advanced to a new form. The salary of the head master is £1000 per annum. His ten assistants receive stipends varying from £525 to £50. We will only add, that besides the school prizes in the shape of money, medals, and books, there are in the two universities fifty or more scholarships of the average value of £60 per annum, open exclusively to those who have been trained in Merchant Taylors' school.

Charter House, London. This school was founded by Thomas Sutton in 1611, and though situated in the very heart of London, the cluster of buildings belonging to it has a preëminently venerable and monastic air. Thomas Sutton was, in his day, one of the merchant princes of London. He was descended from an ancient family, and on the death of his father, he came into possession of a respectable estate, which was vastly increased in the course of years by marriage and business speculations. In 1611 he purchased the estate and mansion then known as Howard House, of the Earl of Suffolk, and soon after obtained letters patent authorizing him to found his hospital and free school at Charter House. The school takes its name from the fact that its site was once occupied by a monastery of Carthusian monks, and down to 1537, when all these establishments were suppressed, it was *The Chartreux*—Charter House being an English corruption of this ancient title. Its history between 1537 and 1611 is full of romantic interest, and connects the spot with some of the most memorable events of that stirring period.

The care of this truly princely establishment was vested by Thomas Sutton in sixteen persons, who were henceforth to be known as The Governors of the Charter House. At the present time, the corporation includes, besides the Queen and the Prince of Wales, some of the most eminent noblemen, statesmen, and church dignitaries of the kingdom. Charter House

differs from the other great schools in one important respect. Besides being a school for youth, it was designed to be a home for a certain class of the old. Through the munificence, and in accordance with the express purpose of the founder, the governors are able to provide eighty decayed gentlemen, officers in the army and navy, literary and professional men, merchants and tradesmen of respectable character, a comfortable retreat, where they are supplied with all things needful for their support and enjoyment, with the privilege of entire leisure to reflect upon the past, and prepare for the future life.

The school is made up of three classes of boys. 1. The foundation scholars. 2. Boarders in the houses of the head master and of the usher. 3. Day boys, who reside with their parents. Of the first class there are at present fifty-five, though the number will shortly be increased to sixty. They are lodged, fed, clothed, and receive their education in all its branches, including French, German, &c., gratuitously. If at the age of eighteen the scholar passes a satisfactory examination, he gets an exhibition at Oxford or Cambridge of eighty pounds a year, and if he enters the ministry, he has a preferential claim to any vacant living in the patronage of the governors. The only expense to which he is liable while in the Charter House is that of a private tutor, if he chooses to employ one, and four guineas per year to the matrons for the care of his private clothes. The annual charge for boarding and education is from eighty to ninety guineas. For the day boys the annual charge is twenty guineas. The latter may enter the school at any age; but no one can get upon the foundation who is under ten or over fourteen. The whole number of scholars now is one hundred and forty, and by an order of the governors it is limited to two hundred.

The classical and mathematical instruction is given by the head master, who has a house and salary of £1260 per annum, the usher who also has a house and £800, and four assistants supplied with lodgings, and salaries varying from £200 to £150. There are also two French teachers and one German. All the boys are required to learn one of these languages. Among the most eminent living Carthusians—as the Charter

House scholars are called—are Bishop Thirlwall, and Mr. Grote, the two distinguished historians of Greece. Thackeray and General Havelock are among the most renowned, who are recently deceased.

Harrow. This school, which derives its name from the village of Harrow-on-the-Hill, about six miles north of London, was founded in 1571, by John Lyon, a yeoman of the town, and for many years it has been almost as aristocratic a school as Eton. Lyon obtained from Queen Elizabeth a charter recognizing his foundation, and vesting the trustees named by him with corporate powers, under the title of "The keepers and governors of the school called the Free Grammar School of John Lyon, in the village of Harrow-upon-the-Hill." He also drew up certain statutes, showing that his design was to bring a free education within the reach of the children of Harrow, but he wisely empowered the governors to make such changes in them as time might suggest. Our limits will not allow us to dwell upon the earlier history of the school, and we therefore proceed to say, that the income of the property bequeathed by Lyon to it for school purposes is only about £1100, and consequently, while here as elsewhere there are foundationers, to the number of forty, the only difference between them and the great mass of students is, that their tuition bills is somewhat reduced.

For nearly a century, Harrow has been more largely attended than any other great school in England, with the occasional exception of Eton; the number now being about five hundred and ten. They are arranged in fourteen divisions, the maximum number of boys in any one being thirty-five. The number of classical assistant masters is fourteen; then there are four mathematical assistants, and two for modern languages, besides the usher and the head master. The position of the latter, though the endowments are so small, is one of the most lucrative of the sort in the kingdom, as his net income exceeds £6000 per annum. From the governors he gets only £50 annually, but the school, tuition, and boarding fees yield a sum considerably beyond £10,000 per annum; so that after deducting the salaries of his assistants, and other charges, the head master's stipend reaches the large figure above given.

The course of study at Harrow comprises classics, arithmetic, mathematics, French, and German. In the classical department there are, besides the head master, fifteen assistants, and the boys are arranged in fifteen divisions, the highest one being the head master's class. Strange to say, it was not until 1837 that mathematics was made a compulsory study. There are now four mathematical assistants, and the divisions are so arranged that each scholar has three lessons a week in this branch. In the modern languages, which have become compulsory studies since 1851, two lessons are given each week. Here, as at Eton, each boy is expected to have a private tutor, that is to say, an instructor having no formal connection with the school, by whose aid he prepares himself for the work of the class-room, and is guided in his private reading. The cost is about £10 10*s.* per annum. Except in rare cases, no boy is admitted to Harrow after he has completed his fifteenth year. A few are under twelve, but the majority who enter are about fourteen. It must, therefore, be evident that with so large a school, the education given in it would be very superficial if the tutorial system was abolished, unless, indeed, the staff of assistants was quadrupled.

Harrow differs from the other great schools in its monitorial system. The first fifteen boys of the head master's class, and therefore of the school, are the *monitors*, and by them its police affairs are mainly managed. Their authority extends over the whole school; they are bound to keep reasonable order among the boys of the house to which he belongs, to investigate and punish any serious moral offence, such as drinking, or profanity, and any violation of a rule of the school, such as smoking, going to a tavern, &c., and on those belonging to the lower forms, he is even allowed to inflict personal chastisement. If a boy demurs to the decision of his monitor, he can appeal to the whole body, and from them to the head master. If the latter satisfies himself that the monitor was right, the appellant must submit to the penalty, or leave the school. The monitors are, of course, the oldest and best students, verging towards young manhood, and have had a four or five years experience of school life. Whether it is wise to clothe persons so young with so much authority over their companions, is a question which

admits of discussion; but a system of school government which has stood so long as this, and is approved by men so eminent as those who have been at the head of Harrow, must have some merits.

We can only add, that the yearly cost of education at Harrow is for foundationers £17 17*s.*, for others, including board, allowances, tradesmen's bills, and extra studies, from £144 to £205.

Rugby is the great school of central England. It was founded by Lawrence Sheriff, a benevolent citizen of London, for the benefit of his native village, Rugby, about the middle of the sixteenth century. He had originally intended to bequeath a certain sum of money for the purpose of establishing the school, but for some reason, he reduced this to £50, and added about eight acres of what was then pasture land within a mile or two of London. To these few acres, now covered with houses, and yielding a revenue of £5000, Rugby owes its opulence and greatness. Like Charter House, Rugby is, on a very small scale, a hospital as well as school, provision having been made by Sheriff for the maintenance of twelve almsmen. But it is only as a school that we are concerned with it.

As a seat of learning, Rugby is indissolubly associated with the name of that prince of educators, Dr. Thomas Arnold, of whom it was predicted when appointed to the head mastership that "he would change the face of public education throughout England," and who nobly fulfilled the prophecy. During the last century and a half, Rugby was presided by many excellent men, and its roll of alumni contained the names of not a few distinguished scholars. Dr. Worll, the immediate predecessor of Dr. Arnold, who held the position for twenty years, though not remarkable for his profound learning, must have been a very efficient teacher and guardian of youth, for he raised the number of pupils to a higher figure than it had ever reached before, three hundred and eighty-one. But the reforms introduced by Arnold, so eloquently described by Dean Stanley, quickly made the name of Rugby renowned throughout Britain, and raised it to a position which it had never before occupied. The work of improvement begun has been continued by his successors, Dr. Tait, now bishop of London, Dr. Goulbourn, and

the present master, Dr. Temple, and it is probably not too much to say, that among the great schools of England, Rugby is now, as for twenty years it has been, the model one.

As usual, the school comprises two classes of pupils: foundationers, or boys entitled to certain privileges in the way of gratuitous education, and non-foundationers, who receive board and education at fixed charges. Of the first class there are, at present, sixty-one. No one is entitled to admission whose parents have not resided two years in Rugby or within ten miles of it. The candidate must be under fifteen, able to read English, prepared to begin the study of Latin, and must bring a certificate from his last teacher. Of the second class there are about four hundred and thirty, making the whole number in the school some four hundred and ninety. They are distributed into three schools, called the upper, middle, and lower. The upper contains one hundred and eighty-seven, the middle two hundred and fifty-five, and the lower forty-eight. Boys in the upper school, who are not destined for the university, may be excused from classical work, so as to pursue a course of mathematics, modern languages, or natural science.

The school is divided into four parts, viz., the classical, mathematical, modern languages, and natural science. The classical again, is distributed into three sub-schools, upper, middle, lower; these are divided into forms, nearly answering to our college classes, and these last are separated into divisions, of which there are twelve. All the boys learn the classics, and are taught in this branch by fourteen masters. The time spent by each boy in the class-rooms, in the upper school, during each week, is fourteen hours; those in the middle school spend twelve. Of course, the work of preparation, as in our colleges, is carried on outside of the class-room, except by the youngest boys of the lower school, under a tutorial system somewhat akin to that which obtains at Eton and Harrow. No boy is allowed to remain at school in the upper form after his nineteenth year, nor in the one next below, after his eighteenth, and so on through all the forms; the evident design of this rule being to make the boys in the several stages of instruction as nearly alike as may be in point of age and attainment.

The mastership of Rugby is a very lucrative position. The

occupant of it has a noble mansion with considerable ground attached to it, and an income of £3000 per annum. The assistant masters, as a whole, are better paid than those of any other great school. Seven of them, one being the teacher of modern languages, receive salaries ranging from £1617 to £1234 per annum, while the salaries of the remaining eleven range from £870 to £286.

Our limits will not allow us to go into further details in regard to this admirable school. Indeed, it is scarcely necessary to do so, as most of our readers, we are sure, must have read Stanley's charming Life of Arnold, in which the methods pursued and the results reached by that eminently successful educator of boys, are so fully described. If any of them have not seen this volume, we cannot do them a better service than to urge them to read it as soon as possible, especially if they have any thing to do with the business of education, or for any reason feel an interest in it.

Want of space compels us also to be content with simply naming *Shrewsbury*, founded in 1562, and *Christ's Hospital*, or the *Blue Coat* School, London, founded about 1550, as well as the four chief modern proprietary schools, Cheltenham, Marlborough, Rossall, and Wellington. The one last named is founded to supply a certain number of the sons of military and naval officers with a free education, and to bring it within the reach of all at a moderate cost. Rossall is designed to do the same kind office to the sons of clergymen.

The history of these great schools is well worthy, as we have already intimated, of the study of those among us who have the means of doing good on a large scale, and especially of those among them who may be wishing to do something to further the cause of popular education. It certainly illustrates how much a comparatively humble individual may do, not simply for his own age, but for after generations. He who founds a school or an academy, under proper conditions, opens a fountain, which shall not refresh with its living waters the inhabitants of his native town, but shall send forth its stream to distant lands. Such a monument is the most enduring one he can erect. If John Lyon had ordered the erection of a mausoleum to receive his ashes after his decease, both he and

it would long since have been forgotten, but no one can get a sight of Harrow-on-the-Hill, and of the school whose fame is spread far as our language extends, without being reminded of its founder. We do not look for the establishment of schools in our country modelled after the precise pattern of those of England; they would not be suited to the state of society here. But the latter have some features, which, to say the least, are worthy of our careful consideration.

We are well persuaded that no better service could be rendered to the cause of education in any of our older states, than by the erection, through private munificence, of an academy (to use our American term), in a well-chosen locality, which should be copied after Winchester, or Rugby, in all points except those which are distinctively English,—an academy in which the education of a certain number would be free, while other pupils paid their own bills: an academy in which the pupils would be stimulated to study diligently, and induced to stay long enough to be thoroughly educated, not only by prizes, but by exhibitions or scholarships in our best colleges, such as Harvard, Yale, or Princeton,—exhibitions which would defray the student's board and tuition during his residence at college. If any of our men of wealth could be excited, as we have said, properly to endow such a school, he would be doing good in two ways, *i. e.*, he would confer a blessing in the locality where the school chanced to be established, and on the college or the university with which he might connect it. In order to raise our colleges and universities to a higher level than that which they have as yet reached, we need collegiate schools thoroughly equipped, in which our youth can be trained, as those are in England, who are preparing for the university, and hope to win some of its prizes; or as the cadets are trained in our own West Point. To make our colleges efficient instruments of a large and liberal culture, the work which they are now compelled to do during the first year of their course, should be done elsewhere. And we are inclined to believe, that if collegiate schools, such as we have suggested, were established, the indirect benefits they would confer upon the college with which they might be wholly, or partially connected, would out-

weigh those produced even by the founding of a new professorship.

The history of the schools and the universities of England furnishes many striking illustrations of the tenacity with which antiquated usages, and even positive abuses, that have become hoary with age, are maintained. In not a few cases, the evident designs of large-hearted men, who lived three or four centuries ago, in a state of society wholly different from the present, have been absolutely defeated by a bigoted adherence to the letter of their statutes. Then there are multitudes of persons, not wanting in intelligence, who dislike change of any sort, though it be from bad to good, or from good to better; and the feeling is strengthened by the notion that the change proposed will interfere with the vested rights of somebody. But great as are the obstacles that have hitherto stood in the way of academic reform, they have begun to yield. There is a growing determination to remodel the schools and universities so as to adapt them to meet the wants of the times, and already improvements have been made in both of them, of which no one dared to dream twenty years ago. In our country, we are never required to fight against men's love for the antiquated. The tendencies here are all the other way. Precedent, prescription, vested rights, are scarcely allowed the weight that belongs to them. Under such circumstances, we should be ashamed if we allow "the old country" to outstrip us in the march of improvement. So far as regards the common school there is no danger of such a result, but we have still much to learn from her, in what relates to the higher order of seminaries,—the schools intended to train and develope the thinker and the scholar.

ART. IV.—*The Raising of Lazarus; treated exegetically with special reference to recent infidel assaults.*

THE raising of Lazarus is, on several accounts, the most momentous of our Lord's miracles. More than any other it sets him forth as "the Resurrection and the Life." In its immediate results it became the outward occasion of his death, and as his last great work it stands out as the presage of his own victory over death.

The omission of the account of this stupendous miracle by the synoptists has been used by hostile critics as an argument against its credibility, and reasoning from the less to the greater, as an argument against the trustworthiness of the fourth Evangelist in particular, and against the credibility of the whole evangelical record in general. The ribald Woolston pronounces this miracle "brimful of absurdities," "a contexture of folly and fraud,"* and Spinoza, on the authority of Bayle,† "said to his friends, that if he could believe the resurrection of Lazarus, he would break to pieces his whole system and embrace without repugnance the ordinary faith of Christians." Of course Spinoza knew very well that the kind of proof he demanded could not be given, and that after all that can be said has been said, the matter finally resolves itself in the veracity of Christ, who declared that Lazarus was dead, John xi. 14; Spinoza did not and would not believe the words of Christ, and his declaration is therefore only an empty bravado.

The explanations of the silence of the synoptists are numerous, but more or less unsatisfactory, and it is doubtful whether a wholly satisfactory solution can be given; this much is certain, however, that the want of a satisfactory solution of the mysterious silence of the synoptists, does not affect the credibility of any or all the canonical Gospels, for that rests on a foundation too firm and too well attested to be weakened by an

* Diss. on Miracles V., cf. N. Lardner's Vindications, Works, ii. 1—54.
† Dict. s. v. "Spinoza."

isolated circumstance of this kind. The most important explanations are:

1. That fear of drawing down persecution on Lazarus and his family during their life-time, caused the first three Evangelists to pass over in silence the account of this great miracle; while John, writing at a later period and outside of Palestine, was not fettered by that reason. This is the view of Grotius, Olshausen, and Lange, who however combines it with other considerations. With certain modifications it is also adopted by Plumptre (in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*,) but rejected as extravagant by Alford and Trench.

2. That the synoptists confine themselves to the miracles wrought by our Lord in Galilee, and hardly touch upon any fact lying outside that limit, (Neander, Meyer); but while this explanation establishes the consistency of the synoptists, it really does not answer the question itself, viz., "Why do all three persist in silence on the miracle?"

3. That the reluctance of Lazarus to draw the veil from his real resurrection from the dead, analogous to a similar reluctance in persons raised from the death of sin, may have induced the earlier Evangelists to honour his sensitiveness in suppressing the account of his miraculous restoration to life. This is the view propounded by Plumptre (l. c.), but although ingenious as a conjecture, will hardly carry conviction to minds of a less speculative constitution.

4. That the nature of the Gospels, each of which being an individual contemplation and composition of the life of Jesus, rendered it necessary that only such historical matter should be received as agreed with and was adapted to the plan of the whole. This is the explanation which Lange superadds to that of Grotius and Neander, without, however, shedding much light on the subject; for while there is doubtless truth in his statement, it is equally true that the synoptists record many things in common, and that the fourth Evangelist narrates many things equally recorded by the synoptists.

The explanations are more or less unsatisfactory, and as they leave the question itself pretty much untouched, we prefer the difficulty unexplained to so-called explanations which increase and complicate it, satisfied that whatever causes may

have operated in the silence of the synoptists, the fact that the bosom friend of Jesus records the miracle is the best and strongest proof of its historic reality and truthfulness. Of the doubts and insinuations of Strauss we shall have occasion to treat by and by.

The question, "Who was Lazarus?" has been variously answered, although the only *positive* data are those derived from the Gospel of St. John, which contain little more than that he was the brother of Mary and Martha, and lived with them at Bethany; that he died, and was by our Lord restored to life. We should content ourselves with the simple recital of these particulars, but in the laboured attempt of Strauss to make out that Lazarus was a mythical character, his reasoning is so characteristic and his conclusions so extraordinary, that we feel constrained to analyze and expose them.

From a comparison of Matt. xxvi. 6, sq.; Mark xiv. 3, sq.; Luke vii. 36, 44, and John xii. 1, sq., it appears that the first two Evangelists narrate that a woman, whose name is not given, anointed our Lord a few days before the last passover, in the house of Simon, the leper, at Bethany, while the third Evangelist records a similar transaction at an earlier period, in the house of one Simon, a Pharisee, by a woman "which was a sinner," without specifying the name of the city or village where it took place, and St. John relates that six days before the passover, Mary, the sister of Lazarus, anointed the feet of Jesus at Bethany. These statements of the four Evangelists, Strauss places in juxtaposition; arranges, disarranges, and rearranges in the most arbitrary manner, and after a great deal of finessing and oracular commenting, reaches the conclusion that the fourth Evangelist combined the notices of the synoptists in order to find a convenient locality for the resurrection of Lazarus, which, according to him, was a myth, invented and fabricated by the author of the fourth Gospel, which, by-the-bye, he pronounces to have been written in the second century. (*Leben Jesu*, l. ii. ch. 2, 77.) If we are to enter the domain of conjecture, the aforesaid data lead to very different results. The anointing related by the first two Evangelists is essentially different from that recorded by the third as to time, place, circumstances, and person, and also in all its

historical and ethical connections and bearings, but agrees in the main with the account given by St. John. The variations are readily accounted for. According to the synoptists, our Lord's *head* was anointed; according to John, his *feet*, but this involves no contradiction, "since both actions are consistent, although both are not mentioned by one Evangelist; unless, indeed, they be so in John xi. 2." (Robinson's *Harm.*) In the synoptical Gospels, *the disciples*, or *some* of them, were indignant at Mary's lavish act of love; in St. John's, it is Judas Iscariot. Here, again, the statements are not contradictory, for we gather from Matt. xxvi. 14, that Judas was the instigator of the discontent of the disciples. Again, the synoptical account lays the scene of the transaction in the house of Simon the leper, whereas St. John says that "they made him a supper" at Bethany, without specifying the name of the person in whose house it took place. But since Lazarus was present, since Martha waited upon Christ, and Mary anointed him, the conclusion is inevitable that the transaction took place in the house occupied by the two sisters and Lazarus. The house may have belonged to Simon the leper, and been occupied by the two sisters and Lazarus; or, if we are to give credence to the apocryphal notice of Nicephorus (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* I. 27,) that Simon the leper was the father of Lazarus, the whole difficulty would vanish. Others suppose him to have been the husband of Martha, which is possible, but not probable; the epithet "*leper*," by which Simon was distinguished, is not so important as some imagine, for neither the synoptists, nor St. John, say that he was present at the feast; the reference is simply to his *house*, and it is altogether immaterial whether he had been cured of his leprosy by Jesus, or not. Most of the conjectures concerning Simon are the result of an attempted identification of Simon the leper with Simon the Pharisee, (Luke vii. 36,) but considering the commonness of the name of Simon, and of the hospitable rite of anointing, the occurrence of a similar transaction at a different time, under different circumstances, and at another place, cannot present a difficulty to those who are not bent upon creating difficulty and confusion, in order to pervert the plain sense of Holy Writ. Putting all these considerations together, we have the general

result that the account of St. John agrees with that of the first two Evangelists, that it must not be confounded with that recorded in the third Gospel, and the minute and undesigned coincidences between the former accounts, brought out by seeming variations, afford the strongest possible proof for the genuine historical character of the Gospel of St. John, and show the slender foundations on which the shadow-building of the mythical theory is made to rest. We have purposely omitted the details of the complicated process by which Strauss works out his theory on the aforesaid data, because we feel sure that the specimen which we are about to give, as having a more direct bearing on the subject under notice, will abundantly justify our strictures and criticisms; but not to anticipate. Strauss (l. c. p. 479) says: "Thus far nothing has been said of the brother of the two sisters, of Lazarus, with whom we are more immediately concerned. The synoptical tradition must also have lost him in the first case," (viz., that the account of the fourth Gospel is true, which Strauss denies;) "which, by reason of the unique miracle connected with his name, is hardly conceivable. But, one might say, it has not lost him; Luke also mentions a Lazarus; to be sure, not a real Lazarus, but only a parabolical one, the poor Lazarus, that is to say, who in this life lay, covered with sores and suffering want, at the rich man's gate, but after death removed to Abraham's bosom, excites the envy of Dives enduring the pains of hell. (Luke xvi. 19, etc.) Both these Lazaruses are indeed not unrelated. The Johannine Lazarus indeed, as far as he can see, is not poor, like the parabolical Lazarus of Luke; but he is also sick, and the introductory words of the narratives of both exhibit a remarkable similarity. 'Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany,' begins John; 'and there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus,' is the beginning of the parable of Jesus in Luke. Both Lazaruses die and are buried; the one, indeed, returns from the grave to life, but—the other, at least, ought to have returned—the boon was asked, but not granted. But why this refusal of the rich man's prayer in the parable, that Abraham would allow Lazarus to go to his father's house that he might convert his five brethren? Because Abraham foresees that

those who refuse to hear Moses and the prophets would not believe though one should rise from the dead. And how rightly did father Abraham foresee? One really rose from the dead, Jesus, but did the Jews on that account believe? Yea, a Lazarus, just as the rich man had desired it, rose from the grave, and the Jews, for all that, instead of believing, formed the resolution to kill Jesus." Strauss might have gone further, and added, that the raising of Lazarus and of Jesus notwithstanding, he also persists in unbelief, and that the more he reads of the evangelical record of the life, the teaching, and the love of Christ, the more determined he grows to crucify him again. But let us hear the further oracular utterances of the destructionist. "What then? Are we to suppose that tradition has turned the historical Lazarus into the parabolical Lazarus, the miracle into a parable, the reality (the return of a dead man) into a mere supposition? Those who have any idea of the manner in which such stories are turned round and enlarged, will think the reverse more probable."

We may hazard here another interruption of Strauss's argument. The last sentence is calculated to suggest the idea, that this practical exhibition of *his* skill in turning round and enlarging the data of the Gospels, affords us an insight into the mythical character of his myths, and the best remedy for the alternative he proposes—that is, its unqualified and indignant rejection. If it be necessary or desirable to establish a connection between Lazarus of Bethany and Lazarus of the parable, the combination of Luke xvi. with John xi. would yield the result that the parable was uttered a day or two after our Lord received the message about Lazarus. If this be so, the name of the sufferer in the parable may possibly have been suggested by the name of Lazarus of Bethany, on whom Jesus may have been thinking at the time, and in whose history there may have been *possibly* some circumstances of resemblance to that of the Lazarus of the parable. (Ellicott, *Hulsean Lect.* p. 243, note.) But let him finish his argument: "The fourth Evangelist had received into his plan two sisters living in a village, who were wont to entertain Jesus, of whom mention is made in the third Gospel, inasmuch as one of them appeared to him to be well

suited for being charged with the anointing and the other with waiting at the meal during which the anointing took place. Obliged for that purpose to locate them at Bethany, the traditional site of the anointing, no place could be better located for the resurrection-story he wanted to give, than just this Bethany. It was designed, as the miracle of all miracles, to conclude the record of the miracles wrought by Jesus, and to bring the bitter hatred of the dominant high-priest and Pharisee-party at Jerusalem to a climax, and must therefore have happened in the last time either in the capital or its environs. Laying the scene in the capital would have contradicted the pragmatism* of the fourth Gospel, according to which Jesus would prefer shunning Jerusalem in that last time, because of hostile ambuscades, and when there, had every reason to be on his guard; a neighbouring village would suit much better, and the anointing story suggested Bethany. The sisters having been once located there, they waited, as it were, for the brother, who is forthwith brought to them in Lazarus. That this is the way in which the fourth Evangelist got his representation, that he first took the sisters from the third Gospel and then associated with them Lazarus, betrays itself in the manner how he introduces the three for the first time. (John xi. 1, sq. "Now a certain *man* was sick, *named* Lazarus of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha. It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick! A brother is described in this manner only if his sisters were better known than himself, and Mary and Martha were better known from the narrative of Jesus lodging with them in the third Gospel, to which incident the fourth Gospel refers also in the words 'the town of Mary and her sister Martha,' for Luke begins his account with saying that Jesus on his journey entered into a certain village, and that Martha received him into her house. (Luke x. 38.) The fourth Evangelist, moreover, adds that this Mary was the woman who anointed Jesus, although he does not relate the transaction until afterwards; this preliminary remark looks exactly as if he wanted to circulate this

* For brevity's sake I retain this German word, which denotes a treatment of history with reflections on the causes and effects of events.

notice for the first time. But he betrays still more obviously that he introduces in Lazarus a new personage into the evangelical history; for this Lazarus was surely not '*a certain man*,' a brother of more celebrated sisters, if he was the subject of the greatest miracle that Jesus wrought, while Jesus loved him as well as his sisters.

"The fourth Evangelist, then, had removed the two sisters to Bethany, which was the most suitable locality for the performance of his final miracle, which was intended to be a resurrection of the dead. The idea, at least, of associating one to be resuscitated bodily with those sisters already resuscitated spiritually, as their brother, lay not very remote. But the two synoptical accounts of persons restored to life did not suit him for the further development of resurrection-story. He wanted to have an unquestionable and certain case of death, at least one in which sepulture had taken place, and this could not be said of the daughter of Jairus, or the young man of Nain. But Luke made mention of a defunct person, although only defunct in the parable, who was buried and unquestionably dead, for his soul had already been carried into Abraham's bosom. He also was to return, but not permitted to do so, because it would have been useless, since he would not have converted the brothers of Dives. But on that very account the fourth Evangelist deemed it worth while to make the defunct person return to life in reality, in order to give the strongest proof of the incorrigible unbelief of the Jewish people. On that account no personage of the synoptical tradition was in all respects better suited to be the hero of the resurrection-story which the fourth Evangelist wanted to supply, than the Lazarus of Luke's parable. Now since these considerations show as clearly whence the fourth Evangelist gets his Lazarus and surroundings, as it is unaccountable where the other Evangelists have put him, if he really did exist and was raised by Jesus from the dead, we may, it seems, consider the investigation on this point brought to a close."

It seems hardly credible that a man like Strauss, who takes such unwarranted liberty with the evangelical record, affects such reverence for historical truth, demands impossible proof for every statement of Holy Writ, and exacts impossible infor-

mation on every point unnoticed by any of the Evangelists, that a man who refuses to believe anything without the clearest and most incontrovertible proof and evidence, can be serious in the expectation that his explanations, founded solely and entirely on arbitrary dicta and unwarranted assumptions, should be accepted by intelligent readers, whom he has taught the use of tests, which, applied to his explanations, statements, and arguments, must scatter them to the winds. If the account of this greatest of the miracles of Christ, as given by the fourth Evangelist, so full of beauty and simplicity, so touching in its human sympathies, so marvellously transparent, replete with self-evidencing truthfulness (Meyer), is to Strauss a rhetorically embellished myth, invented and manufactured of historical and parabolical notices taken from the synoptical Gospels, what shall we say of *his* account, made up of fallacies, perversions, innuendoes, suppressions, additions, fictions, and speculations, which requires not faith, the faith he so much ridicules and scorns, but a credulity bidding defiance to reason, common sense, and historical truth? That account can only be received by those who believe in the infallibility of Strauss, and admit his claims as the apostle of progress, for which he would fain set up. To all others his account will be a veritable myth, and a poor one too; an impossible fiction, an utter failure in its attempt to show the fourth Evangelist to have been an inventor of myths, and in the total absence of a sufficient motive for his assumption of such a character.

Before passing on to the details of the miracle, this seems the proper place for a brief consideration of other so-called explanations which, like that of Strauss, explain the truth away, and give in its stead fictions, myths, and most preposterous solutions.

The explanation that Lazarus was not really, but only apparently dead, is that of Paulus, Ammon, Schleiermacher, Schweizer, *et al.* It rests on an exegesis, by no means redounding to their glory, which reduces the miracle to an accident, and makes Jesus actually sanction a pious fraud. These hints, thrown out by German rationalists, in language ambiguous and obscure, have been turned to good account by the Frenchman, Renan, who avows that something took place

at Bethany, which was considered as a resurrection, which he explains as an intrigue of the family of Bethany. Indignant at the treatment which Jesus experienced at Jerusalem, his Bethany friends sought to give the sickness of Lazarus a turn that should stop the mouth of his enemies, and might benefit his cause. Lazarus is supposed to have improved during the absence of the messengers sent by the sisters to Jesus in Peræa, and to have consented to their proposition to submit to being wrapped up in grave-clothes and shut up in the family tomb. On the arrival of Jesus, Martha took him to the tomb; overcome by profound sorrow, he desired to have a last look at his friend, and the stone being removed, Lazarus came forth in grave-clothes from the tomb. The spectators saw in this a miracle, a resurrection. As for Jesus, Renan continues, he was not more able to control the mania of his disciples and the spectators for miracles than was St. Bernard or Francis of Assisi. He suffered himself to be more charged with the miracles that were expected of him, than that he wrought them. He was no longer master of himself, but at the mercy of his fanatical followers. Death, moreover, would in a few days restore to him his divine liberty, and deliver him from the fatal necessities of a role which grew daily more exacting and more difficult to sustain. (Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, pp. 255—257.)

This preposterous compound is the legitimate outgrowth of the views of Paulus, etc., and not much worse than the explanation of Weisse, who sees in the resurrection of Lazarus a misunderstanding of a conversation of Jesus with Mary and Martha, on the resurrection, occasioned by their brother's death; or that of Gfrörer, who, *á la* Strauss, regards it as a transformed or embellished account of the resurrection of the young man of Nain; or lastly, that of Baur, who turns it into a dogmatico-allegorical representation of the δόξα of Christ. Hase and Schweizer hold the hypothesis of apparent death in a modified but not less repulsive form. Their idea is that Jesus firmly believed that his friend was not really, but apparently dead, and since his confident expectation was fully borne out by the event, which was no real miracle, although there was a miracle, viz., the miracle of justified trust in God. The miracle was not the return of suspended life *per se*, but the coinci-

dence of its return with the confidence of Jesus and the opening of the tomb at his bidding. In plain English, this amounts to nothing more nor less than that Jesus, although informed of the death of Lazarus, conceived the idea that he was only apparently dead, and that God would honour his confident expectation by causing the suspension of life to cease in answer to his summoning Lazarus from the grave. We not only agree with Ebrard (*Weisenschaftliche Kritik*, p. 463), that such an explanation, according to which Jesus would have been guilty of tempting God, (for none of those men are genuine believers in the divinity of Jesus Christ,) contains ten times more improbabilities than twenty critics are able to find in the evangelical record, but also with Strauss, that it reviles Jesus fully as much as deists and scoffers ever reviled him, adding, however, Strauss to the number of the latter, and giving him the full benefit of his own criticism.

The account of the miraculous raising of Lazarus, the moment the *reality* of the miracle is abandoned, amounts, in the opinion of Strauss, to the alternative either of sacrificing the honour of Jesus to the truthfulness of the record, or of sacrificing the truthfulness of the record to the honour of Jesus and sound reason. The last named authors belong to the former category, whereas the latter includes Ewald, who believes Lazarus to have been in a trance, and to have been raised by Jesus from the *grave* (not from the *dead*), but that the Evangelist, recollecting the resurrection of Jesus, and anticipating the general resurrection, writing his Gospel in old age, embellished the account of the *wakening* of Lazarus so as to appear like a veritable resurrection. The language of Ewald, (*Johanneische Schriften*, i. 314 sq.; *Geschichte Christus*, p. 358,) as quoted by Strauss, (l. c. p. 485,) seems certainly to warrant this exposition of his views, and to place him in the category assigned to him by Strauss, although the latter appropriately belongs to both, for he is as ready to revile Jesus as to slander the Evangelist. Turning from those revilers of the Lord and defamers of the Evangelist to the category of believers who acknowledge the reality of the miracle, and the truthfulness of the evangelical record, and adore Jesus as the Resurrection and the Life, we abandon the domain of conjec-

ture and speculation, and enter the hallowed precincts of revelation.

The opening sentences of St. John's account acquaint us with the locality where the miraculous resurrection of Lazarus took place, and incidentally point to the relations of friendship subsisting between Jesus and the family of Bethany. The identification of Mary by an allusion to a transaction which took place *after* the raising of Lazarus (cf. John xi. 2, with xii. 1, sq.) is characteristic of the beloved disciple, (John iv. 46; x. 40; vii. 50; xix. 39; xii. 1; xviii. 14; xi. 49; xxi. 20,) and natural, if it is remembered that he wrote his Gospel long after the event had occurred, and that Mary was a celebrated personage, whose memory lived in the oral tradition of the primitive church. Bethany lay on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, about fifteen furlongs (one and a half miles) south-east from Jerusalem. The etymology of its name is uncertain; according to Simon it denotes "a low place" (*locus depressionis*), according to Lightfoot, Reland, and others, "a house of dates," or "a place of palms," (*locus dactylorum*); here resided the two sisters and Lazarus their brother, to whose house Jesus was wont to retire during his repeated and protracted visits to Jerusalem. Its present condition may be inferred from the following notices of recent visitors. "A wild mountain hamlet, screened by an intervening ridge from the view of the top of Olivet, perched on its broken plateau of rock, the last collection of human habitations before the desert hills which reach to Jericho—this is the modern village of El-Lazarieh." (Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 186.) The traditional sites of the house of Simon the leper, of Lazarus and his tomb, are rather apocryphal. Of the latter, Porter (*Hand-book*, i. 188) says: "This is a deep vault, partly excavated in the rock, and partly lined with masonry. The entrance is low, and opens on a long, winding, half-ruinous staircase, leading down to a small chamber, and from this a few steps more lead down to another, smaller vault, in which the body of Lazarus is supposed to have lain. The situation of the tomb in the *centre* of the village scarcely agrees with the gospel narrative, and the masonry of the interior has no appearance of antiquity." "By the dim light of a taper we descended very

cautiously, by twenty-five slippery steps, to the reputed sepulchre of Lazarus, or El-Azariyeh, as both tomb and village are now called. But I have no description of it to give, and no questions about it to ask. It is a wretched cavern, everyway unsatisfactory, and almost disgusting." (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, ii. p. 599.) Robinson (ii. p. 101) emphatically denies the genuineness of the site, on the ground that the form of the sepulchre is not that of the ancient sepulchres, and that its position is in conflict with that assigned to it in the Gospel." (John xi. 31—38.)

While our Lord was at Peræa, about twenty-three miles distant from Bethany, Lazarus was taken sick, perhaps with one of the sharp, malignant fevers of Palestine, and the sisters despatch a messenger to Jesus with the simple tidings: "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest, is sick." This message is a touching illustration of their trust in Him, of whose love they were certain (v. 5), and of whose prevailing power with God they were equally sure (v. 22). Hence they ask Him not to come, they make no request whatsoever, but confine themselves to the simple announcement of their brother's sickness, well knowing that more was not necessary. (Augustine, *Ev. Joh. Tract.* 40: "Non dixerunt, Veni. Amanti enim tantummodo nuntiandum fuit . . . Sufficit ut noveris; non enim amas, et deseris.")

The Lord's reply to the messenger, probably uttered in the hearing of the disciples, must have been, and was probably intended to be, a sore trial of the faith of the sisters, for when the messenger brought back the message of Jesus: "His sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby," Lazarus was dead, indeed the notes of time interwoven with the narrative, seem to render it almost certain that he was dead when the messenger of the sisters came to Jesus, for we read first that after the arrival of the messenger our Lord abode still two days in the same place where he was, (v. 6), and allowing two days for the journey from Peræa to Bethany, we learn further that Lazarus had been dead four days when Jesus reached Bethany. (v. 39.) How then are we to understand these words? Certainly not in any sense, which would make Jesus ignorant of the true condition

of things; they are "purposely enigmatical," designed to try the faith of the sisters, and referring not to death, but to the resurrection of Lazarus. The sickness wes not sent to end in death, but in the restoration of Lazarus to life, "for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." Jesus knew that Lazarus was dead, before he set out for Bethany, (v. 14), and the dark meaning of his words had been approximately caught by Martha, (v. 22.) The gracious design of the sickness of Lazarus presents an exact parallel to the congenital blindness of the man mentioned, John ix. 3, sq. That design, however, was not exclusive, and doubtless involved the spiritual development of Lazarus himself, and we may say with Trench (*Mir.* p. 315) that "the Son of God was first glorified *in* Lazarus, and then *on* him, and through him to the world." Noteworthy is also the reflection of Hilary on that parable. "Inseparable is God's honour from the honour of Christ. How altogether one and the same they are, may be shown from this very passage. Lazarus dies for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified. What doubt can there be that the glory of God consists in the glory of God's Son, since the death of Lazarus, which was conducive to God's glory, was designed to bring glory also to the Son of God."

The Evangelist's statement that "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus" (v. 5) between the message he sent back to Bethany and the fact of his abiding two days longer at Peræa, seems designed to contrast the conduct of Jesus with his well-known feelings for that honoured family, to intimate by that contrast that *love* was the cause of his delay, or, in the words of Bengel, to suggest "the motive of the resuscitation and the whole course of action preceding it." Love was doubtless the motive, as it is the best explanation of our Lord's conduct. The hypothesis that he lingered in Peræa, because his spiritual duties there were too important to admit of his neglecting them in order to bring bodily relief to his sick friend (Lücke) cannot for a moment be entertained, for had he so willed it, he might have healed Lazarus by a word without leaving Peræa. The almost certainty that Lazarus was dead when the sisters' message reached Christ and that he knew it, explains his delay on the ground of love—he had determined

to raise him from the dead, and the interval would discipline both the faith of the sisters and also that of the disciples, (v. 15); the delay would be the chastening of love to the former (Heb. xii. 6), and the event confirm the faith of both, and set forth Jesus as Lord of life and death. His conduct towards the family of Bethany is parallel to his dealings with us in providence. This view of the case settles the charge of "revolting inhumanity" which Strauss fastens on our Lord for suffering his friend Lazarus to die in order to restore him to life, when he might have saved him from the first; for the fact seems to have been that Lazarus was dead when the messenger from Bethany came to Christ, and it was his intention from the first to restore him to life. Strauss finds it here convenient not to say anything of the notes of time, which set the matter in the true light, although he does insinuate that the delay was designed to enhance the greatness of the miracle by making the case of Lazarus resemble as nearly as possible that of those who are to be raised at the last day. This remark intended as a *suggestio falsi*, just as the former is a clear case of *suppressio veri*, tells however against him, for it *does* establish the stupendous character of the miracle.

The remonstrance of the disciples at the Master's announced intention to revisit Judæa, where he had but just now (νῦν) escaped death, by stoning, at the hands of his Jewish enemies, (see ch. x. 31—39,) led our Lord to utter the words, "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world; but if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him." The language is metaphorical, taken from the Jewish mode of dividing the period between sunrise and sunset into twelve hours, varying in length according to the different seasons of the year. Those twelve hours of light designate the time of work, the material sun in the heavens enabling men to walk without stumbling during any part of that day; but after night has set in, men, for want of light, are apt to stumble. The metaphor applies both to the Lord and to the disciples, whose fears he wished to allay. They were wont to hear Him compare himself with the natural sun, and would not find it difficult to catch his meaning. The day,

consisting of twelve hours of light, had not yet expired; the time of work and security was still continuing; his work was not yet done, and while he was doing his appointed work, he was safe, and they, having him with them as their spiritual Sun, were safe also; but when he, their spiritual Sun and Light, should be no longer with them, then it would be night, and then it was for them to walk cautiously, because then they would be in danger of stumbling. The words, "because there is no light in him," implies that their safety lay, as ours does, in absorbing the light within ourselves; the light must be *in* us, would we pass in safety through the darkness of this world. (Cf. John ix. 5, xii. 35, xxxvi. 46.*)

The supposition of Neander that Jesus received a second messenger is purely arbitrary. Christ knew, in virtue of his superhuman knowledge, that Lazarus was dead; he knew it from the first, and his present conversation with the disciples is partly the explanation of his message sent to Bethany, (v. 4,) partly the preparation of the disciples for the resurrection of Lazarus. Very touching is the manner in which he speaks of Lazarus—"*our friend, Lazarus.*" The friendship he bore to him was shared by the disciples. Already assured by the Master that there was no danger in store for them, this appeal to their feelings for Lazarus, doubtless allayed all fears and misgivings for Jesus and themselves. The sad intelligence of their friend's death is first conveyed to them in the *celestial tongue*, as Bengel beautifully expresses himself. *He sleepeth.* But as yet they knew only little of that celestial tongue, for they understood not his meaning when he said, "but I go, that

* Calvin: Vocatio Dei instar lucis diurnæ est, quæ nos errare vel impingere non patitur. Quisquis ergo Dei verbo obtemperat, nec quidquam aggreditur nisi ejus jussu, illum quoque habere cœlo ducem et directorem, et hâc fiduciâ securè et intrepidè arripere potest. Cf. Ps. xi. 11.

Bp. Hall (*Contemp.* iii., p. 382.) "Are there not twelve hours in the day, which are duly set, and proceed regularly for all the motions and actions of men? So in this course of mine, which I must run on earth, there is a set and determined time wherein I must work, and do my Father's will. The sun, that guides these hours, is the determinate counsel of my Father, and his calling to the execution of my charge: while I follow that, I cannot miscarry, no more than a man can miss his known way at high noon: this while, in vain are either your dissuasions or the attempts of enemies; they cannot hurt, ye cannot divert me."

I may awake him out of sleep." "They thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep," a well known favourable symptom in many diseases, and use the Lord's words as a further argument for dissuading him from the journey to Judæa,* for both ideas are implied in their answer: "Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well."

Bengel gives a peculiar turn to the former in describing the disciples as believing Jesus to have sent this sleep to Lazarus, that the event might be as he had predicted, (v. 4.) Death represented as *sleep* was quite a common mode of expression, and must have been familiar to readers of the Old Testament. (Cf. Job xiv. 12; Sir. xlvi. 19; Matt. xxvii. 52; Acts vii. 60, xiii. 36; 1 Cor. vii. 39, xi. 30, xv. 6, xviii. 20, 51; 1 Thess. iv. 13—15; 2 Peter iii. 4.) Olshausen (*in loco*) remarks that the nearest motive to this metaphorical expression may have been the likeness of a dead body to one sleeping, but that the more remote idea, however imperfectly apprehended by the many, of the dead person being also *spiritually* in a sleep-like state, may have been connected with it; and that without advocating the doctrine of psychopannychism,† it may be maintained that the separation of the soul from the body, as the necessary organ of its activity, must bring about a certain depression of its consciousness; wherefore, the Scripture describes the life of the soul without the body as a mere transition state, and acknowledges no purely spiritual immortality apart from the resurrection of the body. The image itself, therefore, could not present much difficulty to the disciples, but the *sense* of our Lord's language, admitting a figurative and a literal construction, was misunderstood by the disciples. But the Lord speedily corrected their error, informing them in plain language that Lazarus was dead, adding, "And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe." Here we have *one* of the key-notes to the right understanding of our Lord's delay. He was training and disciplining the faith of the disciples as much as that of the family

* Thus Chrysostom and Grotius: Discipuli omnimodo quærunt Dominum ab isto itinere avocare. Ideo omnibus utuntur argumentis.

† "The doctrine that at death the soul falls asleep, and does not awake until the resurrection of the body."—*Fleming.*

of Bethany. Step by step, line upon line, the gentle Master educates their faith, and prepares them for the exhibition of his Divine power, which was intended to raise their faith to a higher stage, for "every new step of faith developes faith as to degree." (Meyer.) Our Lord was glad for their sakes that he was not present at Bethany before, not because his presence would have prevented death, but because the raising of Lazarus from the dead would strengthen their faith to a much greater degree than a mere raising him from a bed of sickness. Our Lord's resolve to visit Bethany, the death of Lazarus notwithstanding, suggested the beautiful comment of the devout Hall, which we cannot withhold from the reader: "Even those that write the longest and most passionate dates of their amity, subscribe but, 'your friend till death;' and if the ordinary strain of human friendship will stretch yet a little further, it is but to the brim of the grave; thither a friend may follow us, and see us bestowed in this house of our age, but then he leaves us to our worms and dust. But for thee, O Saviour, the grave-stone, the earth, the coffin, are no bounders of thy dear respects; even after death, and burial, and corruption, thou art graciously affected to those whom thou lovest. Besides the soul (whereof thou sayest not, let us go to it, but let it come to us), there is still a gracious regard to that dust, which was and shall be a part of an undoubted member of that mystical body, whereof thou art the head. Heaven and earth yields no such friend but thyself. O, make me ever ambitious of this love of thine, and ever unquiet till I feel myself possessed of thee." (*Contempl.* iii. p. 387.)

The exclamation of Thomas to his fellow disciples, "Let us also go, that we may die with him," is very characteristic. "He comes before us prominently on only three occasions, of which this is the first, (the other two are John xiv. 5; xx. 24—29,) but from the very expressive indications which the Gospels supply, we have sufficient materials to enable us to conceive his character. He appears to have been a man of earnest mind; capable of strong and disinterested attachments; but of that temperament which looks habitually to the darker side of things; which, out of several future events equally possible, is ever disposed to consider the least welcome as the most

probable, and to distrust extraordinary good news all the more from the circumstance of its being good. This habit of mind we find strongly exemplified on the present occasion. The twelve, with one accord, deprecate our Lord's self-exposure to the powerful enemies in the capital who had so lately threatened him with stoning; and, doubtless, those of the number who shared in any degree the sanguine temper of their chief member,—his willing disbelief of the possibility of the Lord's subjection to shame and death,—must have remonstrated in the hope either that their dissuasions would be effectual, or that their Lord, if he chose to brave the danger, would, by his experienced power, surmount it. But not so thinks Thomas. He is the first to recognize the adverse determination of his Master, and while perceiving, despairingly acquiesces in it; and he says immediately to his fellow-disciples—'Let us also go, that we may die with him;' thus uniting, with a feeling of entire self-devotion, the anticipation that the worst must follow; that in the death of their beloved Master all hope was gone; and that it was well for them who had contentedly shared his fortunes hitherto, to perish also contentedly with him by the hands of his triumphant enemies." (Dr. W. H. Mill.) Chrysostom (in *Joh. Hom.* 62) says of him, that he who now would hardly venture to go *with* Jesus as far as the neighbouring Bethany, afterwards, *without* him, travelled to the ends of the world, to the farthest India, daring all the perils of remote and hostile nations.

The Evangelist's statement that Jesus, on reaching Bethany, found that Lazarus had lain in the grave four days already, must not be construed as betokening our Lord's ignorance of the fact, but as the first announcement of it by some one whom they met in the outskirts of the village, or perhaps by one of the disciples sent by Jesus to apprize the sisters of his arrival. All this is not expressed, but seems to be implied in the evangelical record, (cf. v. 17 with v. 20). Jesus did not enter the village, but tarried outside, (v. 30,) probably because the tombs were there, (cf. v. 31.)

The Evangelist affords us a glimpse of the scene in the house of mourning. The nearness of Bethany to Jerusalem had brought out many friends who had come to Martha

and Mary to comfort them concerning their brother, (*αἱ περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν*, is a later Grecism, and may signify the two sisters only, but denotes more probably Martha and Mary *with* their female acquaintance or companions). "The term has here a peculiar decorum, because those who had come to the sisters were men (*πολλοὶ*), and indicates a household of the higher sort." (Meyer, cf. Winer, *Grammar*, p. 425.) The conventional and formal condolences and consolations lasted from seven to thirty days. The Mishna prescribes seven days' mourning for a father, a mother, a son, daughter, brother, sister, or wife, (Bartenora, on *Moed Katon*, iii. 7). It was customary for the bereaved to receive their "comforters" (generally veritable Job's comforters) in a sitting posture, (Geier, *de luctu Hebr.*) This seems to be intimated in the notice that "Mary *sat* in the house," while Martha went to meet Jesus. The latter probably received the tidings of his arrival outside the house, or, as housekeeper, was more in the way of hearing news than Mary; at all events she hastened forth to meet Jesus without communicating the intelligence of his arrival to Mary her sister.

The first words uttered by Martha on meeting Jesus were, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. But I know that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." The first clause was also the exclamation of Mary, when she fell down at Jesus' feet, (v. 32). This coincidence is instructive in several ways. It shows that the two sisters had much conversed on the subject and reached the same conviction; and, indeed, the words of Jesus addressed to the disciples before they left Peræa imply as much: "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there"—*i. e.* Lazarus had not died. Trench says of Martha's speech: "High thoughts and poor thoughts of Christ mingle here together;—high thoughts, in that she sees him as one whose effectual fervent prayers will greatly prevail—poor thoughts, in that she thinks of him as *obtaining* by prayers what indeed he *has* by the oneness of his nature with God." (So Grotius, "Et hic infirmitas apparet. Putat illum gratiosum esse apud Deum, non autem in illo esse plenitudinem Divinæ potestatis.") It is difficult to portray the exact state of Martha's feelings. Both she and her sister felt

convinced that their brother would not have died, if Jesus had been present; this was "the bitterest drop in their whole cup of anguish;" her mind seems to have oscillated between hope and doubt; the presence of Jesus inspires her with hope, for she expresses implicit confidence in the efficacy of the Master's prayers; moreover, she prefers no *request*, but leaves the case in his hands; still the dimness of her expectations and the weakness of her faith come out in her misunderstanding the assurance of Jesus: "Thy brother shall rise again." Doubtless for the purpose of exercising her faith and raising it from a lower to a higher stage, our Lord clothed this his first intimation of the miraculous resuscitation of Lazarus in indefinite language; he said not "I will raise him *now*," but "he shall rise again." His words are to her but cold comfort, and her answer, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection of the last day," shows that she expected more, that she hoped or longed for something more than the consolation arising from the belief in the general resurrection of the last day. She seems to have thought her brother's immediate restoration to life possible; but her yearning for receiving back the loved dead brother, "contained much that was material and selfish, and had to be thrown aside if the raising of Lazarus was to be profitable to her. For had she received back *Lazarus* merely as a *mortal* from the jaws of death, the peril of soon losing him again by the same enemy would have been most harrowing to her feelings. Hence it was necessary that she should regain him without the possibility of ever losing him, and be rooted with him in the element of the eternal; and to this the deep words of Christ would lead her. He draws her attention from a *lost brother* to a *present Saviour*, both to him and to her, and shows that in him only could she find the perfect remedy of carnal and spiritual death." (Olshausen.) Her reference to the general resurrection at the last day led our Lord to say in reply the glorious words of Christian consolation: "I am the Resurrection and the Life," the deep import of which requires to be considered. They are emphatic and antithetic. *I* am the Resurrection; the resurrection to which you refer is not a future impersonal accident, but the personal operation of Myself, already existing and even now operative. Trench seems to

misunderstand Olshausen when he says that the resurrection "which he attributes to himself is in one aspect *more*, in another *less*, than the life he claims. It is more, for it is life in conflict with, and overcoming death; it is life being the death of death, meeting it in its highest manifestation, of physical dissolution and decay, and vanquishing it there; it is less, for so long as that title belongs to him, it implies something still undone, a mortality not yet wholly swallowed up in life, a last enemy not yet wholly destroyed, and put under his feet, (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26)." This is hardly so, for *the Resurrection* and *the Life* are really equivalent terms, the one stating *negatively*, what the other declares *positively*. Christ calls himself the *Life*, not because he *makes* alive (*ζωοποιεῖ*, John v. 21) but because he is (as Philo says of the Logos, *πηγὴ τῆς ζωῆς*) the *fountain of Life*, because he *is* the fountain of absolute being (*ὄντως εἶναι*). In like manner Christ calls himself the Resurrection, not only because he raises others, but because he *is* the resurrection from the very nature of his being. The resurrection (*ἀνάστασις*), as Olshausen puts it, is Life (*ζωή*) in conflict with and triumphing over death (*Θάνατος*); *ζωή* denotes *absolute being* without reference to *Θάνατος*, and is the *positive* statement of this glorious truth, *ἀνάστασις* is life killing death (in the person of Jesus and in others), and this is the *negative* statement of the same truth. "In this victorious manifestation, life appears in the person of the Lord." The connection of the words that follows with those just noticed presents a difficulty. "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?" Faith in our Lord as "the resurrection and the life" is the medium through which Christians are made partakers of both. Where faith is, *physical death* is no obstacle to *spiritual life*, and *physical life* is sure to terminate in *eternal, spiritual life*. The first clause seems to be an expansion of the words "I am the Resurrection," the second, of "I am the Life." Both clauses portray the effects of faith in Christ as "the resurrection and the life" with reference to the dead and the living, primarily with reference to *physical* death and *life*, secondarily, probably with reference to *spiritual* death and *life*. The second clause is not a mere repetition, but denotes a

progress of the first. We must resolve them after the manner of the older commentators into the parallel; To *dead* believers I am the resurrection, to the *living* the "remedium mortis," nor interpret with Bengel: "Magna differentia inter *mortem* credentium ante mortem Jesu Christi et inter *obitum* credentium post mortem Jesu Christi,"—but

a. *Dead* believers in Christ are not dead absolutely, they shall live, or rather they continue to live, physical dissolution notwithstanding, and they shall be raised from the dead (as was Lazarus physically and spiritually, and the prodigal spiritually.)

b. *Living* believers in Christ, who in the midst of physical life become by faith partakers of the *spiritual* life, shall *never* DIE, physical death will be a *sleep*, but they shall live *physically* and *spiritually* forever, (as in the case of Martha and Mary.)

As we understand this difficult passage, the second clause "and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die," unlocks the meaning and denotes the absoluteness of that life which Christ imparts, in the highest form of its manifestation, including the conquest of physical death. (Olshausen).

Strauss (p. 473) asserts that the foregoing words, beginning with "I am the resurrection and the life," etc., are as much the theme of this Johannine resurrection-story, as the words "The maid is not dead, but sleepeth," are the theme of the common synoptical resurrection-story, and the words "weep not," the theme of that of Luke. Baur, who considers the whole account *invented* by the Evangelist for the purpose of *illustrating* a christological proposition, says of the same words, that they are the real substance, with which the Evangelist is solely concerned, and that everything else is bare external, accidental and illustrative, but really unimportant *form*. But both Strauss and Baur, in their anxiety to invalidate the evangelical record, are involuntary letting out the truths we have endeavoured to illustrate. The former says that the theme of John is distinguished from the said synoptical themes by the general difference between the synoptical Gospels and that of John, who not only represents Christ as Him who in very deed turns death into sleep and dries the tears shed for the departed, but sets forth the Son of God in these attributes as the express object of faith, and this faith as the condition of participation in eter-

nal life, and that the life imparted by him neither denotes only the future, *general* resurrection of the body, nor the present resurrection of an individual, but also the new spiritual life emanating from him; while Baur, referring to Christ's statement that the sickness of Lazarus was not unto death, says: "Jesus therefore here expresses at once the view that he would not allow death to become real and *permanent*." These statements of Strauss and Baur afford an illustration of the valuable uses to which even the confessions of avowed enemies of the evangelical record may be turned.

Our Lord asked Martha whether she believed the glorious truths he had propounded to her. And her reply embodies the truly marvellous confession: "Yea, Lord; I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, which should come into the world," which reminds us of that of Peter, (John vi. 69,) "We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Martha's reply is sometimes regarded as not being the *explicit* confession which Jesus had required of her; but this view cannot be sustained, seeing that she gives an unqualified "*yea, Lord*," in reply to his question; as we take it, her "*yea, Lord*," affirms the belief of the sublime truths which had just been announced, while the words which follow denote the views she entertained then, and had entertained before, of the person of Christ. We do not propose to weaken the force of the words after "yea, Lord," but consider these to *imply* more than is generally thought to be the case. Paraphrasing her reply, we may suppose her to have said: "Yea, Lord, I *believe* all thou hast said, though I hardly understand it yet, but as I have believed heretofore, so I believe now, that thou art the Christ (the Messiah), the Son of God, 'He that should come into the world.'" She names Jesus by three of his great names, and as one of the offices of the Messiah was, according to Jewish expectations, to raise the dead, we may say that Martha, in believing Jesus to be the Messiah, believed also that he was the resurrection and the life, and that he that believeth in him, though he die, yet shall he live. At the same time, the words of Jesus seem to have raised her faith to a higher stage, and filled her with a holy enthusiasm, for her reply (v. 27) indicates an advance both of faith and of

intelligence upon her first greeting (v. 22), in which she seemed to regard Jesus rather in the light of a human being than in that of the Son of God.

Full of blissful expectations, and eager to make her sister partaker of them, she hurried off to Mary, calling her aside, and secretly communicated to her the glad tidings of the arrival of their longed-for friend. Mary, it is to be remembered, was still within doors, surrounded by her mourning friends. *Ἀθρόα*, "*secretly*," denotes that Martha whispered the words into Mary's ears, perhaps fearing the unfriendly disposition of some of the Jews present (and the event showed that her fears were not unfounded, v. 46), or simply desiring a confidential interview between the Master and themselves, or both. The words themselves form no part of the *recorded* dialogue of Jesus with Martha, but the Evangelist acquaints us thus incidentally with this feature of the history of the miracle, even as v. 40 seems to refer to another unrecorded portion of the Lord's conversation with Martha. "The Master," or rather "the Teacher," (*ὁ διδάσκαλος*,) was the term they were wont to apply to Jesus. Mary rose forthwith without acquainting the mourning friends with the cause of her sudden departure, but as it was customary for Jewish women to visit the graves of their kindred, especially during the first days of mourning,* the visitors, seeing the two sisters start in the direction of the grave, naturally inferred that in the depth of her sorrow Mary had gone to give vent to it in tears shed at the tomb of her lamented brother, and followed her. And following *her*, they came to Jesus. Very graphic and characteristic is the account of the interview between Jesus and Mary. He had remained outside the village, probably not far from the burial-ground, "in that place where Martha met him." Mary drew near in haste, and the moment she *saw* him, in the transport of her joy at seeing him, and in the anguish of her grief at the death of Lazarus, fell down at his feet and greeted him with the identical words, spoken before by Martha: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." On this point the sisters were fully agreed. This had been the controlling thought of their minds, the constant

* Wetstein, ad loc.; Geier, *de luctu Hebræorum*, c. 7, 26. This is still the Oriental custom. (Niebuhr, *Reise nach Arabien*, i. p. 186.)

theme of their conversation, the most bitter ingredient in their cup of sorrow. (See the observations above on v. 21.)*

Meanwhile the Jews, who had come to comfort the sisters, had reached the spot, and their lamentations blended with those of the sisters. They were all weeping. The scene must have been overwhelmingly touching and well-nigh baffles description. There are doubtless circumstances connected with it, which are not recorded by the Evangelist, or implied in his statements, although we cannot catch them. This is evident from the effect the scene produced on our Lord, who, "when he saw her weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, *groaned in the spirit and was troubled.*" As the words stand in English, they suggest the ideas of excessive sorrow and profound sympathy with the bereaved sisters, but it is very difficult, if not impossible, to gather that sense from the Greek original, which reads: "ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν." Ἐμβριμάομαι (from βρίμη, βριμώ a name of Proserpina or Hecate, and signifying the wrathful, cognate with *fremo*, βρῖθος, φριμάω), involves the ideas of anger and indignation, wherever found in the writings of the Classics or the Fathers. Applied to horses it denotes snorting, to other beasts, roaring with anger, to Hecate muttering, and in general both in this and other forms, to be wrathful, to be moved with strong indignation, to be wroth at, threaten. But the anger is explained very differently by commentators. Origen and Chrysostom regard Jesus to have been indignant with himself because he wept, but that view originating in Stoical maxims cannot be entertained for a moment. Augustine, Erasmus, and Trench, take the indignation of Jesus at the power of sin and death. Theodoret, Mopanestia, and Lampe, explain his indignation of the unbelief of the two sisters (but they were not unbelieving); De Wette, because he could not have prevented the death of Lazarus and the consequent grief of the sisters, (but he could have done so, had he willed it); Brückner, because enemies prevailed and friends misunderstood his words, (insufficient); Meyer, because the hypocritical tears of the conventional

* Bengel. "Ex quo colligi potest, hunc earum fuisse sermonem anti fratris obitum ; utinam adesset Dominus Jesus."

mourners were mingling with those of Mary, (contradicted by v. 45); Strauss caricatures this indignation into an expression of anger because the Jews did not implicitly receive him. On the other hand, Bucer, Grotius, Nonnus, Lücke, Ewald and Tholuck, think that ἐμβριμάομαι denotes not only anger and indignation but also *pain*, not indeed according to the usage but the *analogy* of language (τῷ πνεύματι being made equal to ἐν ἑαυτῷ, v. 38, and στενάζειν, Mark viii. 12, vii. 34, compared with ἐμβριμάομαι and the Hebrew נאנח rendered by Gesenius "fremo," but the *analogy* of language must yield the place to usuage, and the other passages in the New Testament where ἐμβριμάομαι is used, express indignation. "Twice it is used of our Lord *commanding, under the threat of his earnest displeasure*, those whom he had healed, to keep silence, Matt. ix. 30, Mark i. 43, and once of those who were indignant at what Mary had done in the matter of the ointment, Mark xiv. 5." (Trench.) Lange adopts a combination of both meanings, by making the word ἐμβριμάομαι signify a general affection of the spirit consisting of different and alternating emotions. Tholuck (7th ed.) thinks that the term involves the sensation of shuddering, and that κινεῖσθαι is its proven philological meaning, after the example of the translator of the Peschito version. Lange supports his view by the following considerations:

"1. The selection of the word, because the Evangelist was familiar with other terms denoting the more definite affections of anger and pain.

"2. The words τῷ πνεύματι, which forbid the prevalence of any one *psychical* affection in *the spirit*, the spirit being the all-embracing unit of the variously divided life of the soul.

"3. The psychological experience that the most different affections concur in the greatest excitement of soul-life. He quotes here the lines of Gœthe's *Iphigenia.*

> There rolls a wheel of joy and grief
> Through my soul. A certain awe draws me
> Away from the stranger man; but my inmost
> Soul draws me strongly to the brother.

"4. The situation. The weeping of Mary could not but excite the most profound sympathy. But the weeping of the

better Jews was mingled with that of the unbelieving. There arose a scene of human lamentation of death, a sympathy with the sense of the power of death. While Jesus needed not to shut himself against that sympathy, he had to struggle with it and be indignant at it. But thereby his feelings passed into an enthusiastic presentiment of victory. The profound *emotion* of his spirit was perceived by the disciples in his outward appearance, hence *he troubled himself*. A divine thunderstorm of the Spirit passed through his breast, which shook his human nature."

We have given these different explanations, and think that on the whole the preference lies between the combination view of Lange and that advocated by Augustine, Erasmus, and Trench. We cannot agree with that of Lange on account of its purely speculative and poetical character. The metaphysical distinctions are beautiful, but founded not so much on the legitimate meaning of ἐμβριμάομαι as on the combination of that word with ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν; in like manner the situation is more imaginary than real, and the reference to the *divine* thunderstorm passing through the breast and shaking the *human* nature of Jesus, savours somewhat of the Nestorian separation of the divine and human in the person of our Lord; we accept, therefore, the explanation of Augustine, etc., and say with Trench: "Much better is it to take this as the indignation which the Lord of life felt at all which sin had wrought; he beheld death, in all its fearfulness, as the wages of sin; and all the world's woes, of which this was but a little sample, rose up before his eye,—all the mourners and all the graves were present to him. For that he was about to wipe away the tears of those present did not truly alter the case. Lazarus did but rise again, to taste a second time the bitterness of death; these mourners he might comfort, but only for a little while; these tears he might stanch, only again hereafter to flow; and how many had flowed, and must flow, with no such comforter to wipe them, even for a season, away! Contemplating all this, a mighty indignation at the author of all this woe possessed his heart," adding, however, that his indignation at the author of all human woe did not exclude his sympathy with the painful anguish of the bereaved sisters, for though

now he was about to resuscitate him, he had to die again, and his being raised from the dead did not put an end to universal woe and suffering. This seems to follow from the further incidents related by the Evangelist, for when the people, in answer to the Lord's question where they had laid Lazarus, bade him come and see, Jesus *shed tears*, the "Fountain of pity" weeping with those that weep. These were the tears of sympathy, not tears of *anger*, as the profane Strauss maintains, or tears of *joy*, as Chrysologus and others have held. Blessed tears of human sympathy, shed by the living, merciful Jesus, as he went to assert his empire over death. The bystanders construed his tears differently. Some saw in them the evidence of his affection for Lazarus, and exclaimed, "Behold, how he loved him." "But others (τινὲς δὲ) said, Could not this man, which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died?" There were two classes of persons present, those of a friendly and those of a hostile disposition. The captious spirit of the latter comes out in their reference to the miraculous cure of the man blind from his birth, which had taken place at Jerusalem, and made a profound impression on the minds of the people: it was evidently the general theme of conversation, for this is the second time that the Jews publicly referred to it. (Cf. John x. 21 with ix. 7.) That this reference was made with evil intent, appears 1. From the manifest reproach expressed in the words, which imply either the assumption of his inability or unwillingness to prevent the death of Lazarus; 2. From the effect of their words on Jesus, who experienced a second shuddering, or holy indignation; 3. From the use of the adversative particle δὲ, which distinguishes the latter class from the former; and 4. From the subsequent conduct of those Jews, (v. 46). The supposition of Meyer, that their assumption of Christ's inability to have prevented the death of Lazarus was intended to cast a slur on the miraculous cure of the blind man, seems to be proble. The characteristic objection of Strauss, who sees in their reference to the cure of the blind-born an argument against the truth of the evangelical record, because he thinks that they ought to have referred to other raisings from the dead, mentioned by the synoptists, is readily removed by the considera-

tion that it is very doubtful whether those Jews had heard any thing of the miracles which Jesus wrought at an earlier period in Galilee, whereas the publicity which the judicial proceedings subsequent to the miracle on the blind man had given to that mighty act, renders reference to it both natural and apposite. This circumstance, so far from injuriously affecting the truthfulness of the record, corroborates its fidelity, for if those Jews had cited the Galilean miracles, Strauss would not have been slow to charge the fourth Evangelist with manufacturing his account from synoptical notices; their reference to the miraculous cure of the blind man, as to an event with which they were well acquainted, affords therefore incidental proof of the truthfulness of the narrative.

The tombs of the Hebrews were without the cities and towns, (Luke vii. 12,) and in this respect they conformed to the universal custom of eastern nations. Only kings and prophets were permitted intermural burial, (1 Kings ii. 10; xvi. 6, 28; 2 Kings x. 35; 1 Sam. xxv. 1; xxviii. 3). They were generally caves, either natural (Gen. xxiii. 9) or artificial, that is rock-hewn, (Isa. xxii. 16; 2 Chron. xvi. 14; Matt. xxvii. 60;) situated in gardens or groves. Respectable families had their family vaults, (Gen. xxiii. 20; Judges viii. 32; 2 Sam. ii. 32; 1 Kings xiii. 22,) which were constructed either horizontally or perpendicularly, in the latter case there was a descent by steps. They consisted of several chambers, or divisions, sometimes one above the other, with openings in the sides for the reception of the bodies. It is difficult to determine whether the grave of Lazarus was perpendicular or horizontal. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it. The use of the stone was to prevent jackals and other beasts of prey to enter the tombs. The circumstance that the stone is said to have lain *upon* the cave, as it is rendered in English, does not prove anything, for ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ may mean both *upon* and *before*. The traditional locality is equally indecisive, but the apparent ease with which the people removed the stone favours the idea that the reference is rather to a *loculus*, or side-opening, closed with a stone, than to an entire tomb closed with a stone or door, say six feet by three feet, weighing some three or four tons, and

impossible to be moved without machinery. (See Winer, R. W. art. *Gräber;* Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, art. *Tomb.*

Arrived at the grave, the Lord bade the people remove the stone, when Martha interposed, saying, "Lord, by this time he stinketh; for he hath been dead four days." The manner in which the Evangelist introduces Martha is significant and suggestive. "Saith to him the *sister of the dead, Martha.*" Why this particular account of a matter which is abundantly plain from the former notices? "Probably to explain her remonstrance at the taking away of the stone. She, as a sister of the dead, would naturally be more shocked than another at the thought of the exposure of that countenance, upon which [she feared], corruption had already set its seal; would most shudderingly contemplate that beloved form made a spectacle to strangers, now when it has become an abhorring even to them that had loved it best." (Trench.) The remonstrance of Martha is very characteristic, she hesitates, doubts and speaks, while Mary remains a silent spectator. The fearful reality of the grave and the loathsome concomitants of death arise before her and cause her faith to waver. It is to be borne in mind that her words are merely expressive of her fear, purely conjectural, uttered before the grave was opened, and not founded on experience in that particular case. It was rather the application of her experience from other instances of mortality to the case of her loved brother, that led her to conclude that the usual phenomena had set in. This is evident from the reason she adduces for her opinion: τεταρταῖος γὰρ ἐστι; it is the fourth day since he was buried. That the change she dreaded might have ensued is rendered highly probable by the well-known rapidity with which decomposition sets in in that country ("the Talmud and the Targums refer proverbially to decomposition taking place on the third day after death"); but that it had ensued in the case of Lazarus cannot be proven; indeed the language of the Evangelist and the season of the year (it was winter) forbid such an hypothesis, which would, as Olshausen justly remarks, give to the miracle a *monstrous* character, and it is certainly better and more congenial to a Christian mind, if suppose we must, to assume with him that the body of Lazarus was divinely guarded from corruption, and to argue with

Trench, who adopts the suggestion of Olshausen, from the less to the greater, that "if the poet could imagine a divine power guarding from all defeature and wrong the body which was thus preserved only for an honourable burial (*Iliad*, xxiv. 18—21), by how much more may we assume a like preservation for that body which, not in the world of fiction, but of reality, was to become again so soon the tabernacle for the soul of one of Christ's servants;" the hypothesis that the body of Lazarus had already undergone corruption, would be *monstrous*, for even in respect of the general resurrection it is not the corruptible that shall be *raised*, but the corruptible shall *put on* incorruption, and mortality shall be *clothed* with immortality.

The remonstrance of Martha we understand to imply want of faith on her part, a departure certainly from the lofty belief to which she had so recently given utterance, and this unbelief the Lord rebukes in the words which follow. "Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God?" There is no record of these words in the dialogue between Jesus and Martha at their first meeting (v. 28, as has been intimated above); but we may either regard this a further record of that conversation "on the power of faith as the means of making our own the fulness of the powers residing in Christ" (Olshausen), or connect that conversation with the first tidings Martha received in reply to her message, to wit, "this sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God," and suppose that those mysterious words formed the theme of their dialogue.

This gentle rebuke of Christ had a most salutary effect on Martha, her unbelief gave way before the comforting and encouraging words of Jesus, for her silence, taken in connection with the obedience of the company, implies that now she did fully and freely acquiesce in the commandment of the Lord. "Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid, and Jesus lifted up his eyes" (cf. Mark vii. 34; John xvii. 1,) from the object of mortality to heaven, as Bengel beautifully puts it, and said: "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." This is really a thanksgiving, not a prayer; but thanksgiving in the case of our Lord does

not imply a previous prayer, still less an inferiority and dependence of Christ; it is to be taken rather as an assertion of the unity of being and will of God the Father and God the Son (Maldonatus), and the union of the Divine and human nature in the person of Christ. It is immaterial whether we take the first words: "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me," spoken in tones so loud as to be heard by the whole surrounding multitude, and the rest in a lower key and heard only by the disciples, or the whole uttered in the same key; the great truth, they assert, remains unchanged. In ch. xii. 30, a similar thought is addressed immediately to the people and that analogy renders the latter hypothesis probable in the present instance. Doubtless the thanksgiving was uttered by the Lord on account of the surrounding multitude, the scope of this the greatest of his miracles being to persuade the people of the true character of his mission, that his power was from above, not from beneath, that his will was in perfect union with that of the Father, and that the Omnipotence of the Father was in perfect union with the Son. He needed not to pray for himself, "He prayed for our sakes, that we might know him to be the Son. His prayer did not benefit himself, but it benefitted our faith. *He* did not want help, but *we* want *instruction.*" (Hilary.)

The real *animus* of Strauss comes out in his comment on this passage. The condescending, loving regard of our Lord for the spiritual needs of the spectators of the miracle, his patient and considerate enlightening their minds, and thus weaning them from the prejudices and false views of the expected Deliverer, is to that irreverent man "an accommodation." He says: "Now if an accommodation is to have the desired effect, the person accommodating himself must not say that it is only an accommodation, while a prayer said only for the purpose of accommodation is an *offensive grimace.* They thought themselves witty who said, against the view stated by the critics, 'that John's Christ is only a personified dogmatical conception,' that a conception does not attend a wedding, or show compassion and such like. But here one may say on the contrary, that no real man, though he were God-man, would act as John's Christ is said to have acted near the grave of Lazarus, that only a personified conception composed of two contradictory

marks could have acted in such a manner. John's Christ is on the one hand the eternal creative Word, one with God; he therefore needs not pray or thank the Father for any specific thing, seeing that the whole of his doings is only the successive streaming forth of that which eternally streams into him from the Father; but, on the other hand, he walks as a man among men who is to lead them to the Father, point them on every occasion to the Father, and least of all must not omit doing this in the performance of a work which, as the raising of a dead person, so peculiarly manifests the glory of the Father. He therefore utters a loud prayer to the Father, and rather a prayer of thanksgiving than one of supplication, which, because of the seeming uncertainty of being heard, would be more liable to be misinterpreted; but inasmuch as he is both man and the incarnate Logos, prayer with him is mere accommodation, and inasmuch as he also wishes to be acknowledged as the Logos, he says himself that he did not utter the prayer for himself, but solely for the benefit of the surrounding spectators. Taken as a real being, as a man, the Christ of the fourth Gospel appears in this praying from accommodation as *an actor*, and his confession that his prayer is mere accommodation shows him moreover to have been *unskilful at that;* but even taken as a personified conception, he here exhibits in a peculiar manner the contradictory marks which are combined in him in an inconceivable unity."

It is difficult to determine which is worse, Strauss's logic or blasphemy; the two are so well matched and so closely interwoven that their separation is well nigh impossible. This deliberate perversion of the truth into caricature, this adding insult to injury, is a species of argument which infidels and profane men may call ingenious, but which the lovers of truth will brand as malicious blasphemy. The explicit declaration of Jesus that he thanked God for hearing him, not because himself needed to pray, but because the people needed to know and to believe that he was sent by the Father, ought to disarm all suspicion, for it is the language of truth in beautiful consistency with the whole account of his Divine origin, both as given by this Evangelist and the synoptists, foretold by the prophets, and commented upon by other inspired writers of the New Testa-

ment. As we read the words they betoken at once the Lord's confession of oneness with the Father and exceeding tenderness of regard for those he came to save, to whom he was sent, but who received him not; the company at the grave of Lazarus included some who even resisted the stupendous proof of Christ's words furnished by the resurrection of Lazarus, but the many were convinced thereby of his Divine mission, and believed on him. The construction put upon this thanksgiving of Christ could only occur to a man like Strauss, who among all possible explanations are sure to select the most unnatural and degrading, and never scruple to suggest ideas, not so much the result of sober reasoning as of morbid speculation, which too often show that the author's wish is father to the thought. Strauss wishes to explain away the reality of our Lord's existence, and the tyranny of that wish makes him a miserable reasoner, a sophist, a caricaturist, and a blasphemer. We can only lament that so much learning and ingenuity should be wasted in the bootless and hopeless attempt of destroying the faith of the people—no wonder, that the man whose set purpose is to *destroy* belief should be peculiarly bitter in a comment on a passage like this, expressly declared to have aimed directly at the assurance, establishment, and building up of the belief of the witnesses of the raising of Lazarus.

The words of Pearson on this subject are very apposite: "Whatsoever miracle Moses wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else consulting with God, received it by commandment from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as inhering in him. Whereas this power must of necessity be in Jesus, 'in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' (Col. ii. 9), and to whom the Father had given 'to have life in himself.' (John v. 26.) This he sufficiently showed by working with a *word*, commanding the winds to be still, the devils to fly, and the dead to rise. . . . Once indeed Christ *seemeth* to have prayed, before he raised Lazarus from the grave, but even that was done 'because of the people which stood by.' Not that *He* had not power within himself to raise up Lazarus, who was afterwards to raise *Himself*, but 'that they might believe the FATHER had sent him.'" Chrysostom in the same spirit bids us remark that he does not say "'In my

Father's Name come forth,' or '*Father*, raise him,' but throwing off the whole appearances of one praying, he proceeds to show his power by acts. This is his general way. His words show humility, his acts power."

"And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." We notice here first the loud voice, which may betoken the strength of our Lord's affection for Lazarus, or answer to the greatness of the work (Hall), but more probably had reference to the witnesses of the miracle, who would know thereby that no other agency but the word of Jesus was employed in this stupendous unheard of work; Jesus crying with a loud voice would be heard by all, and all would know that no magical incantations, but plain words were used. We may also regard the loudness of the voice as typical of the voice of the Son of God in the general resurrection, when "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth" (John v. 28), of the *shout* with which the Lord shall descend when "the dead in Christ shall rise" (1 Thess. iv. 16), and perhaps "of the last trumpet" (1 Cor. xv. 52), which seems to be identical with this voice of the Son of God. The words themselves are remarkable, both as to form and substance. They are an authoritative command, couched in terms of familiarity. "Here is no suit to the Father, no abjuration to the deceased, but a flat and absolute injunction" (Hall), a simple summons addressed to the dead man in the language of familiar discourse. "He calls Lazarus *by name*, lest he should bring out *all* the dead," says Augustine, but it is doubtful whether that remark, however beautiful and striking, can be sustained, for the economy of grace has its appointed season for every stage of its development. Origen and Chrysostom suppose that Lazarus was already reanimated before the Lord uttered the thanksgiving prayer, and simply issued from the tomb in answer to the summons to come forth, but it is better to regard the summons itself, "this divine and royal command," as the moment of reanimation. The pious reflection of Hall points out the personal application Christian readers are apt to make of the call to Lazarus: "O Saviour, that is the voice that I shall once hear sounding into the bottom of my grave, and raising me up out of my dust; that is the voice that shall

pierce the rocks and divide the mountains, and fetch up the dead out of the lowest deeps. Thy word made all, thy word shall repair all. Hence, all ye diffident fears; he whom I trust is omnipotent."

In answer to the majestic summons, "Lazarus, come *out*," (*Λάζαρε, δεῦρο ἔξω*, literally, "Lazarus, hither! out!") he that was dead *came out* from the dark recess of the cave, "bound hand and foot in grave-clothes; and his face was bound about with a napkin." Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, and among modern writers, Lampe and Stier, see here a "miracle in a miracle," (*θαῦμα ἐν θαύματι*, Basil.) "Processit ille *vinctus*: non ergo pedibus propriis, sed virtuto producentis." (Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* ci. 21), inasmuch as Lazarus, though bound hand and foot, was able to answer the summons, but this supposition seems to conflict with the words that follow, "Loose him, let him go," and can hardly be borne out by the terms rendered "grave-clothes" and "napkin," which are apt to mislead the English reader. The *grave-clothes* (*κειρίαι*), denote narrow strips of linen which the Egyptians used to wind round every limb, and the *napkin* (*σουδάριον*), the *sudarium*, was a linen cloth or handkerchief wound round the forehead, which in the case of mummies reaches down to the chest. If this was the manner in which the body of Lazarus had been prepared for the grave (and the terms used decidedly favour such a preparation) there is no difficulty as to the mode of his progression. He could move—but the *sudarium* depending from his forehead and all his limbs tightly wrapped up with linen bandages put a restraint upon his motions, and we may imagine him to have walked with the hesitating, uncertain motions of a somnambulist. Certain it is, that he did walk, either in the manner described, or in some other way, and that the grave-clothes and the napkin impeded his progress. (v. 44.)

The feelings with which Mary and Martha, the disciples of Jesus, and the Jews, must have gazed upon the passing wondrous spectacle of a dead man, summoned from the grasp of death by the voice of Jesus, advancing in the habiliments of the grave from the dark recess of the tomb, we are hardly in a position to describe; joy, ecstatic joy, commingling with fear on the part of the sisters, amazement and awe on the part of

the others; all doubt must henceforth vanish from their minds as to the Divine mission of Jesus, now they knew that he is the Resurrection and the Life, and though even some of the spectators of this greatest of miracles seem to have persisted in unbelief, *many* believed on Him. And if it is difficult for us to enter into the feelings of the sisters, it is well-nigh impossible for us to conjecture those of Lazarus who, after an absence of four days in the world of spirits, was suddenly recalled to the world of sense, to be greeted by loving friends and blessed with the welcome of Jesus. Of the eagerness with which the sisters welcomed him, or of his anxiety to fly to their loving arms, we have perhaps a hint in the words of Jesus addressed to the spectators of the miracle: "Loose him, and let him go." He that could break the adamantine fetters of death might easily have burst the linen ligaments which encumbered the body of Lazarus, but his bidding others perform that office may have been from a desire of giving to *all* the opportunity of handling Lazarus, while it affords incidental proof that his rising again was real and not phantastic.

Beyond the solitary notice that Lazarus was present at the supper prepared for Jesus at Bethany (John xii. 1), Scripture is silent concerning him. According to an old tradition mentioned by Epiphanius, Lazarus was thirty years old at the time of his resurrection and lived thirty years longer. (Epiph. *Hær.* bk. 34, p. 652). In the ninth century his bones were pretended to have been found in Cyprus, (Suicer, *Thes.* 2. 208); but this seems to conflict with the Western tradition that he, accompanied by Martha and others, went to Gaul and became bishop of Massilia, (cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* 3, 475 sq., and his *Lux Evang.* p. 388, sqq., Thilo, *Apocryph.* p 711, and *per contra* Launoii *diss. de Lazari, etc., appulsu in Provinciam*, Op. ii. 1). All these notices are of course apocryphal and unreliable, nor is it necessary to dwell on them at length, although the reader may be interested to know one circumstance connected with these legendary notices, namely, "that the first question Lazarus asked the Lord after he was come back from the grave, was whether he should have to die again, and learning that it needs must be so, that he never smiled any more." (Trench, l. c., p. 332.)

Here the history of the miracle itself closes, and as it is foreign to our purpose to trace its connection with the subsequent part of the life of our Lord, we close our account with a passing reference to the allegorical interpretation of this miracle, which was very prevalent in the ancient church, and with writers like Bourdaloue and Martin. Bourdaloue, after the example of Augustine, Jerome, Bernard, and others, has a very ingenious sermon based on the history of this miracle, entitled, "*Sur l'eloignement de Dieu et le retour à Dieu*," in which he traces the different steps of a sinner's death and resurrection to life. The first step towards spiritual death is sickness, (John xi. 1,) the second, lethargy, (v. 11,) terminating in death, (v. 14,) burial under the stone of evil habits, (v. 17,) and corruption spreading to others, (v. 39). Then follows a description of his conversion, beginning with the zeal and prayer of the sisters, (vs. 3, 22,) followed by the condition enjoined by the Lord, (v. 39,) the removal of the stone denoting the casting away of the beggarly elements of the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life: the summons of Christ and the obedience of Lazarus, (vs. 43, 44,) showing the necessity of sinners leaving, at the bidding of Jesus, the darkness of sin and making open confession, and lastly, receiving absolution, (v. 44.)

This specimen is sufficient to show the arbitrary character of the allegorical interpretation, which frequently sets aside historical veracity and exegetical correctness. We do not wish to be understood as absolutely condemning it, for it often serves a good purpose—*but only where it adheres to fidelity of statement, and follows a sound exegesis:* these are clearly the bounds it must not transgress, or we shall have fiction instead of truth, and the thoughtless may imperceptibly and undesignedly drift into skepticism and infidelity, from the habit of hearing the literal and historical sense, if not explained away, at least made subordinate to the allegorical instruction based thereon. It is quite true that so early a writer as Augustine said, "We do not, because we trace an allegorical or mystical meaning in facts, forfeit our belief in them as literal occurrences," but the synopsis of Bourdaloue's sermon, founded on that father's interpretation, shows the danger of a forced appli-

cation of the allegorical sense to *every* part of the history. The resurrection of Lazarus, *as a whole*, may be considered as emblematic of the restoration of a soul at the voice of Jesus sounding in the gospel, even as the other two instances of Christ raising the dead may be illustrated in the same way, without any phantastic disfiguring of the language of Holy Writ, which warrants us to see in death a metaphor of sin, and to deduce the great truth that Christ raises to newness of life sinners of all degrees; that his grace extends even to the most abandoned. The case of the ruler's daughter, who had just died, may be taken as symbolical of the spiritual restoration of one who has just sunk into sin; that of the widow of Nain's son, carried out by the gate, as emblematic of the conversion of an open and hardened sinner; but that of Lazarus, who had lain four days in the grave, as typical of the spiritual regeneration of one who was, to all appearance, irrecoverably lost.

This miracle has always been considered as the greatest miracle which Jesus did; it was a favourite subject of early Christian art in all its stages, which sometimes represented Martha kneeling at the feet of Jesus, sometimes the Lord touching with his wonder-staff the head of Lazarus, who is placed upright (which is a mistake, and a transfer of Egyptian customs to Judæa,) and rolled up as a mummy, (which was nearly correct [?],) in a niche of the cave; and sometimes he is coming forth from thence at the word of the Lord. (Münter, *Sinnbilder der alten Christen*, ii. 98.) Trench calls attention to the curious custom of the Byzantines, as mentioned by Chrysostom, and of the contemporaries of Asterius, to have this and many other miracles of our Lord woven on their garments. The extract from Asterius is by no means flattering to the spirituality of the Christianity of that day. "Here mayest thou see the marriage in Galilee and the waterpots, the impotent man that carried his bed on his shoulders, the blind man that was healed with clay, the woman that had an issue of blood and touched the hem of his garments, the awakened Lazarus; *and with this they count themselves pious, and to wear garments well pleasing to God.*"

Art. V.—*Personal Reminiscences of the Life and Times of Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the city of New York.* New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

The appearance of these volumes has been eagerly welcomed by the Christian, and especially the Presbyterian public. Various circumstances invest them with peculiar interest. Dr. Spring is an octogenarian. His public life runs back nearly to the beginning of the present century. He has been the distinguished pastor of one of the most prominent churches in the country for more than fifty-five years. In this conspicuous post he has, from the first, been in the very front rank of American preachers, and among the most successful of pastors. Born, reared, educated in New England, the son of a leading Hopkinsian divine of eminent piety, who took a prominent part in founding and shaping Andover Theological Seminary, himself a participator in the Hopkinsian and New Haven, and various other controversies connected with the disruption of the Presbyterian church, he is not only the strongest living link between the ecclesiastical past and present, but between the Presbyterian and Congregational bodies, once maintaining an intimacy of mutual fellowship which, if it has abated, has not utterly ceased. All these and many other circumstances impart a special interest to the reminiscences of Dr. Spring, and will lead a wide circle, particularly of Presbyterians, to examine its contents with avidity.

The preparation of such a book, by a man past eighty, is a phenomenon. It has its advantages and disadvantages. It gives something of the charm which attaches to the marvellous. Of course, it is no disparagement to say that tokens are not wanting, that the work is not what it would have been had it been written earlier, occupied a longer time, and had more pains-taking elaboration. Of this the venerable author seems to be fully sensible. "Another embarrassment which I deeply feel, is the fact that I am too far advanced in years to have

any very strong expectation that my life and health will be prolonged to the completion of that which I have undertaken. I am driven to the work; I am running a race with time; it is too hasty an effort. Could I have had two years for it, instead of the four months it has occupied, it might have been more interesting, as well as more instructive." Vol. i. pp. 8, 9.

Notwithstanding any drawbacks on this account, however, we are thankful for the many valuable documents, precious mementos, instructive reflections, and important testimonies which the book contains. To know simply the personal history, training, habits, methods, development, of such a man, the results he has achieved, and the relation between his personal characteristics and ways, on the one hand, and his great public achievements on the other, is itself a treasure. The light, too, shed on great public events and questions with which the distinguished author has been connected, is, of course, important. We shall proceed to call attention to such matters, practical and doctrinal, brought to view in these volumes, as most concern our readers.

Dr. Spring's lineage was of the "seed royal" of heaven, and in the line of the covenant. His mother's ancestors, for several generations, were ministers of the gospel, Nonconformists and English Puritans. Her grandfather, Rev. Samuel Hopkins, D.D., of West Springfield, Mass., (not the author of Hopkinsianism,) was the son of a sister of the elder President Edwards. His father was the Rev. Samuel Spring, D.D., pastor of an important church in Newburyport, Mass., descended also from some of the best Puritan stock. He was educated at Nassau Hall, a thing not uncommon at that period for the sons of New England. He studied theology for a time with Dr. Witherspoon, whom he greatly admired. He, however, afterwards studied with Bellamy, West, and Hopkins, and, as the result of the whole, became a determined Hopkinsian, quite a leader in his day of that more moderate portion of this school that did not follow Emmons, who, by marriage, appears to have become his kinsman. At all events, Dr. Emmons addresses Dr. Gardiner Spring as his nephew. While in College, he was the roommate of President Madison. His tutor was the younger Edwards, who stimulated his metaphysical powers. He also fell

under the influence of a resident graduate, named Periam, brilliant both in physical and metaphysical philosophy, for whom he cherished the warmest admiration. This man, of such great early promise, appears to have either died early, or otherwise fallen into obscurity. But he, like many others of that day, became a Berkleian, and for a time succeeded in inoculating Samuel Stanhope Smith, afterwards President of the College, and young Mr. Spring, with his views. Says his son: "My father was interested in Berkley's philosophy; and but for the influence of Dr. Witherspoon, might have adopted the opinion that the objects of perception are not real existences, and are simply ideas which exist only in the mind." So it appears that discussions on "Hard Matter," of which Dr. Spring complains as unprofitable in our present periodicals, were current in the days of our fathers.

Dr. Gardiner Spring was born in Newburyport, February 24, 1785. Few men have enjoyed a more thorough Christian training, or, during childhood and youth, breathed an atmosphere of purer domestic piety. The letters of his mother, published in the first volume, and the high-toned religious character of his father, are sufficient proof of this. The effect is apparent in repeated seasons of seriousness and alarm, not without occasional intervals of trembling hope, especially under impressive sermons, and in times of revival, through his childhood, youth, and early manhood. He entered Yale College in 1799. His eyes becoming weak, through severe study, his father wisely withdrew him at the end of Freshman year, and, after a year's absence, permitted him to return to a lower class. He was a severely diligent student, and graduated with the highest honour of his class. The topic of his valedictory oration, *Aut Cesar aut nullus*, was significant. His father, after the conclusion of the commencement exercises, took an affectionate leave of him, and threw him upon his own resources, he having but four dollars in his possession. He cordially accepted the allotment: at once commenced the study of law, and sustained himself by leading singing in church, and teaching sacred music: while Moses Brown, Esq., one of his father's parishioners, whose name is inseparably connected with the munificent endowment of Andover Seminary, at his request,

loaned him two hundred and fifty dollars, on his own terms. Afterwards he accepted an invitation to teach a classical and mathematical school in the island of Bermuda. Meanwhile he was married. He earned enough to support himself and family until he was established in the successful practice of law in New Haven. Having reached this point, his religious impressions were revived and developed into such clearness of Christian faith and hope, that he made a profession of faith in the Centre church, New Haven, then under the pastoral care of Rev. Moses Stuart, afterwards the celebrated Professor of Biblical Exegesis and Literature at Andover.

He soon found his mind dissatisfied with the law, of which he had been a very thorough and zealous student, and in which he had already won an encouraging practice. His heart yearned for the ministry. He found himself interested in attending and addressing religious meetings in the suburbs of the city, and was ill at ease in the prospect of devoting his life to secular occupations. At length his mind was brought to a decision in the following manner, which is well worthy of record:

"At the following Commencement of Yale College, I was to take my degree of A. M., and to deliver an oration. My theme was the 'Christian Patriot:' nor were my views as yet decided with regard to the change in my professional career. Early on the morning after the Commencement, the Rev. Dr. John M. Mason preached his great sermon on the text, 'To the poor the gospel is preached.' As I led the choir, I sat immediately opposite the preacher. And never did I hear such a sermon. I could not refrain from weeping. Hundreds wept. Dr. Dwight wept; Dr. Backus wept like a child; senators wept. When I left the church, I could think of nothing but the *gospel*. I crossed the green exclaiming, 'the gospel! the gospel!' I entered the little parlor where my lovely wife was nursing her babe, and exclaimed, 'the gospel! the gospel!' I thought, I prayed, I resolved, if the providence of God should prepare the way, to become a preacher of the gospel. I said nothing but to Mr. Evarts. My purpose was formed." Vol. i. pp. 97–8.

These details we have selected and condensed out of an indefinite number, scarcely inferior in interest, for the purpose

of bringing to view the early moulding influences, and personal characteristics, which contributed to form the future pastor of the Brick church. His purpose once formed, in dependence on God, ways and means were quickly found for carrying it through. A wealthy lady of Salem, Massachusetts, Mrs. Mary Norris, learning his circumstances and plans, took his family, now consisting of a wife and two children, under her hospitable roof and provided for them, while he pursued his studies in Andover Seminary, then just established. In less than a year he was licensed. He received formal calls or informal overtures for settlement in a number of important churches in New England, but for various reasons declined them. Soon, however, passing through New York, and preaching an evening lecture for Dr. Romeyn in his absence, he was heard by some members of the Brick church. They soon procured him to preach a Sabbath, and immediately gave him a unanimous call, which he accepted. Having experienced some friction in his examination before Presbytery, on account, as he says, "of the views I THEN entertained on the subject of human ability," he was duly ordained and installed in the pastorate, which he has so honourably filled, during the life-time of two generations.

We will now ask the attention of our readers, first to the practical, and then to the doctrinal points, which deserve notice in these volumes. There is nothing in Dr. Spring's life and history more instructive and profitable, than his methods of preparation for the pulpit, and of manifold pastoral labour. His transcendent success, in these respects, renders his example worthy of all consideration by junior ministers and candidates for the ministry. The following extracts speak for themselves. They show no royal road, but only the beaten track of incessant toil, and a wise husbandry of time and resources, as the only and sure condition of ministerial success or eminence. After his ordination, he says: "By solemn oath I was pledged to my work, and set about it in earnest, though with fear and trembling. I neglected everything for the work of the ministry. I had a strong desire to visit the courts, and listen to the arguments of the eminent jurists of the city: but I had no time for this indulgence. I had none for light reading, none for even-

ing parties, and very little for social visiting or even for extensive reading. Everything was abandoned for my pulpit ministrations. I had warm friends in the Presbytery, in New England, in New Jersey, and in the eastern section of Long Island. And more than all, I had good courage. Three of the eight sermons I had prepared before I left Andover, I had preached in New York already, and the remaining number was kept good for several years. Under God it was this laborious and unintermitted effort that saved me from shipwreck. . . . . Not every man, either among ministers or their hearers, is aware of the incessant and severe labour that is called for in the successful prosecution of the ministerial office. He must be thoroughly a working man. It is work, work, work, from the beginning of the year to the end of it. There is nothing of which I have been constrained to be more economical and even covetous than *time*. I have ever been an early riser, and even in mid-winter used to walk from Beekman street round the 'Forks of the Bowery,' now Union square, before I broke my fast. I usually went into my study at nine o'clock, and after my removal to Bond street, more generally at eight, though my study was opposite the City Hall, and more than a mile from my residence. . . . . Nor have I ever been the advocate of night studies or night parties. These last would long ago have been the death of me. In whatever else I have been wanting, my habits have been habits of industry." *Id.* pp. 105—6.

The following passage presents the same fact in another important aspect. The habits and modes of preparing for the pulpit, of such a man as Dr. Spring, reveal the true secret of success in himself and others.

"I have preached many, very many, very poor sermons, but very rarely one that was hastily written. I have found that my mind was uniformly most active at the close of my Sabbath services; and for a series of years I rarely retired to my pillow of a Lord's day evening without having selected my subject for the following Lord's day. I found great advantage in doing this, in that my mind was not embarrassed by conflicting subjects, or no subject at all; in that I had a subject to think of, to pray over, and sometimes to dream about; and in that one

subject naturally led to another. More generally, and almost uniformly, I began my sermon on the morning of every Tuesday; so that if I finished it by Friday noon, I had one day to spare for general reading. If my subject required more than a week's study, I gave it two weeks, sometimes three, sometimes four, and in one instance *six* weeks, and was greatly the gainer by so doing. One sermon, thus elaborated and prayed over, is worth to the *settled pastor* and to his people more than a score of hasty discourses. In order to carry this arrangement into effect, I obtained help from my brethren, or fell back upon the old store, or preached with no other preparation than a few outlines of thought treasured up in memory and delivered without notes. I say 'delivered without notes,' because I found by experience, that when my mind was divided between my notes and my invention, I was more embarrassed than when my invention was left unshackled. I have reason to believe that some of my best and most profitable discourses, saving a few outlines of thought, were truly extemporaneous, and so literally extemporaneous that from beginning to end I did not know beforehand what would be my next sentence. I say 'literally extemporaneous.' In one view only is this true, and in another, it must be borne in mind, that they are the result of some mental discipline, and express the thoughts laid up by previous study and the use of the pen. If he has self-possession and the use of language, attained by reading, writing and study, and any interest in the object of his vocation, any man can preach extemporaneously, and preach well." *Id.* pp. 110—11.

In regard to preaching with or without written preparation, we find the following additional judicious observations, which seem to us quite timely as respects this important but much mooted question.

"On the subject of preaching with notes or without them, it is difficult to express any satisfactory views. A minister's mind needs the careful and laborious culture of the pen; when this is attained and persevered in, the more he preaches without notes the better. If he has the spirit of devotedness to his work, intellectual resources, self-possession, a free command of his mother-tongue, intense interest in his subject, and confidence in God, he will preach far better with nothing before

him but God's Bible and the God of the sanctuary. If a man can lose sight of himself in preaching, and rise above the fear and applause of his hearers; if he can be so thoroughly master of his subject that in his illustrations his memory shall not embarrass his invention, he will preach better without notes than with them. The danger with extemporaneous preachers is, that they are not students; the defect and danger of written discourses, that the preacher has not the confidence to look his audience in the face unless he is endorsed and sustained by his manuscript.

"My own discourses on the Lord's day have been for the most part written out, and with care, because I am conscious that I lack those prerequisites for a purely extemporaneous preacher. My weekly lectures have never been written; I have rarely carried anything in the form of paper into the pulpit in these services. They have cost me no labour except a solitary walk, or a ride on the saddle; yet they have been among my best discourses. They have been *studied* discourses, not of the day, but of years of study long since past, gathered up and concentrated for the hour. A fanatical and ranting preacher once appointed a religious service in the town of Bethlehem, where Dr. Bellamy was the settled pastor. Dr. Bellamy went to hear him; but in the presence of this distinguished man, the interloper refused to open his lips. After much disappointment, Dr. Bellamy was urged to conduct the service, and he did so, and preached without notes, and with great power. 'Mr. Bellamy,' said the stranger, 'did you never study that sarmont?' 'YES,' vociferated Dr. Bellamy, '*twenty years ago.*'" *Id.* pp. 115, 116.

The main point here signalized is thoroughness of preparation for each particular exercise, so far as circumstances admit, supported by that general study and mastery of topics which renders one *semper paratus* on occasions for which there can be little or no special preparation. As to the mode of preparation, whether by writing out in full, and then memorizing or delivering from a manuscript, or by otherwise making one's self fully master of the subject, and the occasion, as to manner and matter, no uniform rule can be laid down. Here everything depends upon the peculiarities of the minister and his people.

The method best for one man is worst for another. Only one thing can be laid down of universal application. That is the necessity of incessant and wisely directed study, both for the general furnishing of the mind, and the best practicable preparation for each particular public exercise. This is the sure and only means of permanent success and usefulness in the ministry. Others may boast of what they can achieve by the force of genius, by off-hand, unstudied, rambling effusions. The great and mighty preachers and pastors, who have sustained themselves in widening usefulness, and brightening fame, till past three-score-and-ten, have been thankful, if they could instruct and profit their hearers by means of study. Dr. Spring made all things bend to, and subserve his pulpit preparations. He says:

"I have rarely been embarrassed for want of subjects. The wonderful facility with which one subject leads to another—the state of the congregation—an interview with some individual or family—a watchful observance of the leadings of Divine Providence—intercourse with ministerial brethren—some unexpected suggestion during the night-watches—a solitary ride on the saddle—my 'index rerum'—and the inexhaustible treasures of the Bible—furnished me with subjects which I have not yet overtaken. My reading has been uniformly with a view to enrich my mind for my pulpit ministrations. To this end I have not slighted the works of the great Errorists; and have felt strong for the truth of God the more I have possessed myself of their sophistical reasoning."

In regard to the themes and tone of his preaching, he says:

"I have generally aimed to preach on *important subjects*. The more important they were, the better were they suited to my taste and my wishes. I have laboured to distinguish between the precious and the vile; to insist largely and earnestly between the friends of God and his enemies, and 'say to the righteous it shall be well with him, and say to the wicked it shall be ill with him.' I began my work rather with the view of being instrumental in the conversion of sinners, than of comforting the people of God. I have found, too, that the discourses prepared for unrepenting men more generally interested,

and, indeed, comforted the people of God. I early found that I could more easily prepare a good sermon from an awakening and alarming subject, than from one that is more comforting. The fact is, I knew more of the terror of the law than the preciousness of the gospel. My own obligations to holiness, the strength and the evil of sin, my absolute dependence upon sovereign grace, my infinite and everlasting desert of God's displeasure, were subjects with which I was familiar. I knew much about them from my own experience. Of other and less distressing thoughts, though they have not been hidden from me, and have sometimes made my bosom warm and my tongue glow, I knew less, and felt less deeply. I could never understand why the great body of ministers preach with less embarrassment on fearful themes, than on those which are more attractive, unless it be that an alarmed conscience has more to do with our preaching than a loving heart; nor how this can be except that the heart is by nature desperately wicked. The difficulty of *preaching well* on the more attractive and winning themes, has sometimes alarmed me, and made me fear lest after having 'preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away.'" Id. pp. 109—10.

Again:

"I endeavoured to exhibit the fundamental doctrines of grace as the great means of bringing the benighted and lost out of darkness into God's marvellous light. I dwelt largely on the Divine attributes: upon the spirituality and obligations of the Divine law: upon the unmixed and total depravity of man: upon the all-sufficiency of the great atonement, the fulness there is in Christ, and the unembarrassed offer of pardon and life to all that have ears to hear: upon the great wickedness of unbelief: upon the absolute dependence of saint and sinner upon the power of the Holy Spirit: upon the Divine sovereignty and electing love: upon the perfect righteousness of Christ as the only ground of the believer's acceptance with God," &c., &c. Pp. 129—30.

It is this class of topics that alone can permanently give body and force to preaching, or penetrate the souls of men. He who brings such truths home to the hearts and consciences of his people, will find that the word so preached by him is "quick

and powerful." He will not need to discourse of secularities in order to interest his hearers. The sinners in Zion will be afraid. Fearfulness will surprise the hypocrites. Troubled souls will hang with breathless attention on the preacher's lips. Others will rejoice in hope, as they are pointed to Christ and him crucified, by him whose speech and preaching are not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.

All who have observed the earlier and later sermons and publications of Dr. Spring, have doubtless observed the gradual mellowing of his tone, by the benignity of the gospel, so that, without ceasing to persuade men by the terrors of the Lord, he was in his later ministry wont, more and more, to constrain them by the love of Christ. This is a welcome change. No doubt, the theology in which he was trained accounted, in part, for this predominance of the alarming and terrific in his early preaching. This, however, is to be observed, that it is quite easy and common for ministers to lose sight of the denunciations and threatenings of the word of God against the sinful and impenitent, regarding them as overshadowed by the attractions of the cross; to overlook the lightnings of Sinai, as they charmed with the benignant radiance of Sion: to forget that the law gives us a knowledge of sin, and is a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ. We have often had a painful impression, that many ministers would rejoice in more conversions, and greater fruits of their labours, if they would unfold the law more fully in its precepts and penalty, so searching the hearts of sinners, and extinguishing every hope of salvation out of Christ. Unless the preacher echoes and re-echoes the scriptural warnings and threatenings to the impenitent, few of them will realize their ruin, danger, or the urgent necessity of fleeing from the wrath to come to the hope set before them. All one-sided presentations of the Divine attributes are mischievous. Sinners must be made to "behold the goodness and severity of God," or they will stand on slippery places, till they slide down to perdition. The degree of prominence which should be given, at any period, to these respective phases of scriptural truth, depends on circumstances. When men have long spurned the love of God in Christ, it may be needful to reiterate the terrors

of the Lord, till obdurate souls indeed feel that "he is a consuming fire." The great power of Dr. Spring's early ministry, the repeated and great revivals with which it was blessed, seem to indicate a then state of the public mind, that was not harmed by what, under other circumstances, might have been an undue preponderance of alarming, startling, or even "legal" preaching. Not that he ever lost sight of the gospel as the balm for wounded sinners—but that he found it powerless upon men, until they were made conscious of wounds and bruises and putrefying sores that needed such Divine medication. Our observation has led us to the belief, that very many preachers at this time would find the evangelism of their preaching more powerful, if they would rouse their hearers to a better appreciation of it, by more abundantly and earnestly warning them to flee from the wrath to come.

One other extract on this subject, upon which Dr. Spring has a right to speak with an authority second to no living man, puts in a strong light a truth well worthy of the prayerful consideration of all ministers, especially those who are mourning over a barren and fruitless ministry. It is necessary to be not only industrious in the preparation of sermons, but to shape them all to the accomplishment of the great end of preaching, the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints.

He says:

"The *great end and object* of the ministry, though very imperfectly, I have endeavoured constantly to keep before my mind. I have generally found that laborious ministers gain their object. If it is to write *elegant* sermons, they write them, and gain their object. If it is to write *learned* sermons, they write them, and gain their object. If it is to *enrich their discourses* with the pithy and concentrated sentences of other days and great men, they do it, and gain their object. If it is to be popular, they are popular, and there the matter ends. They look no further. They gain their object, and have never thought of any thing beyond it. It was not the conversion of sinners they were aiming at, and therefore they never attained it. I know a most worthy minister who preached more than a year to the same people, and his preaching was sound in doctrine, logical, and able; but during that whole period I have

yet to learn that a single sinner was alarmed, convinced, or converted to God. And the reason is, that was not his object. He did not study for it, nor pray for it, nor preach for it. He gained his object most effectually, but it was not the conversion of men.

"I have adverted to this kind of preaching, because, as it seems to me, this is the snare of the modern pulpit. I have listened to not a few sermons within the past ten years, in which there was no want of instruction; they were full of solid and weighty truths; great pains were taken, in the use of metaphor and illustration, to indicate the preacher's progress in science, and to show that he stood abreast with the improvements of the age; but in which the great end of preaching was lost sight of—the turning of the wicked from the error of their ways—the salvation of the immortal soul. The preachers had power, but their minds were not directed to this great object. With all their intellectual effort, there was a want of amplification and earnestness in addressing the different classes of their audience, and crowding the conscience of the impenitent. Why is it that there is so little adaptation in so much of the preaching of the present day to produce the conversion of men? Too many ministers preach now as though they thought all their hearers were Christians, overlooking the multitudes who are dead in trespasses and sins, and pressing on in the broad way that leads to destruction!" Pp. 206—8.

Preaching to be seen of men is one thing, to save souls another, and, as in the case of praying and almsgiving, is apt to gain the reward it seeks, and to fail of that which it does not preëminently seek.

Among the embarrassments of his early ministry, was the practice of his predecessors relative to infant baptism. Dr. Rodgers, Dr. McKnight, and Dr. Miller, had been in the habit of baptizing all the children of the congregation without regard to the Christian character and profession of either of the parents. He felt constrained to adopt a different course, and to baptize only those children, one of whose parents was a professed Christian. Of course the introduction of the strict practice encountered some antagonism, which he, however, speedily surmounted. Dr. Spring expresses his warm approval

of the celebrated Report on Infant Baptism, presented to the General Assembly, and prepared by Dr. Romeyn.

Fashionable amusements presented a difficulty more insuperable. Says Dr. Spring, "in this matter, 'old Adam was too hard for young Melancthon.' It is a foregone conclusion that our young people will dance. I regret it in Christian families, but I cannot prevent it. Our mercurial youth live for folly and fun. 'The heart of fools is in the house of mirth.' I have observed one thing, however; that when the Spirit of God is poured out upon us, there are no balls and assemblies; there is more prayer and praise than dancing. It is a grief of heart to the ministers of Christ that Christian families are so extensively the patrons of fashionable amusements. The giddy companions of the world, the sons and daughters of pleasure, give little proof of a Christian training." *Id.* p. 128.

The next topic of high moment handled in these volumes, is Revivals of Religion. In regard to the first season of refreshing under his ministry, he writes as follows:

"This season of mercy was an emphatic expression of God's goodness to the youthful minister. He had been but six short years in the ministry, but God foresaw that he was to occupy a place in his earthly sanctuary for more than half a century. It was a weary wilderness he was appointed to traverse, and the God of Israel refreshed him with some of the grapes of Eshcol. Poor a thing as I have been, and still continue to be, with devout gratitude I record it here, that it was this work of grace that made me what I am; which enlarged my heart, gave vigour to my thoughts, ready utterance to my tongue, new views of the great object of the ministry, made my work my joy, and stimulated me to reach forward to greater measures of usefulness. I loved preaching the gospel before, but never as I have loved it since. But for this early season of mercy during the summer of 1814, I should have changed from place to place, and turned out what the Scotch call a 'sticket minister.' It was the Lord's doing, and marvellous in our eyes. The ingathering was not great, but it was the 'finest of the wheat.'" Pp. 163—4.

We have often observed that nothing so perfects ministerial and pastoral education as a great baptism of the Spirit in a

powerful revival of religion. This experimental teaching gives an insight into the true method of dealing with souls, in public preaching and private intercourse, which no amount of scholastic attainments or severe study can supply. For this, as well as so many other reasons, the young pastor should crave, pray, labour for a revival of religion, as the most inestimable of blessings. This great revival brought into the Brick church a large number of people in middle and advanced life, who, although they had been regular attendants upon and supporters of the church, had never yet consciously or professedly embraced salvation. During the next winter a visitation of grace still more powerful prevailed, especially among the youth of the congregation whose parents had been gathered in the previous summer. Besides this, there were other seasons of general awakening and revival in the old Brick church. But this appears to have been the most powerful and extensive of all. As Dr. Spring's account of it is not only extremely interesting and instructive, but brings into strong relief the measures employed, which stand in contrast to the fanatical measures and Pelagian preaching of Mr. Finney and other Western revivalists, elsewhere strongly reprobated by the venerable author, we will give it entire. In regard to all the revivals under his ministry, he remarks that, judging by the fruits, they were the work of the Spirit. The subjects of them, with few exceptions, have turned out intelligent and active Christians. Some are sceptical in regard to these seasons of special and prevailing religious attention, apprehensive that they will evaporate in fleshly excitement, without any pure and enduring fruits. This may be true of superficial and spurious excitements, got up by artificial machinery and unscriptural devices. These often give birth to an Ishmael, instead of an Isaac, the real child of promise. But in regard to those profound and extended awakenings, which arise from and are guided by scriptural truth, we apprehend that there will be vastly more irreligion and false religion in any congregation without them than with them. As one fruit of these revivals in Dr. Spring's church, it at one time contained sixty members, whom he could call upon to lead in prayer, and who, in little companies, held weekly meetings in different neighbourhoods of the congrega-

tion. We now give his account of the second great revival in his congregation.

"The commencement of the year 1815 was the dawning of a still brighter day. The last Sabbath of the 'old year,' and the evening services of that Sabbath, will be long remembered. The 'New Year's sermon,' preached on the 'last day of the old year,' and printed under the quaint title of 'Something Must be Done,' has been widely circulated, and, by the Divine blessing, I have reason to believe, was of some service beyond the limits of our own congregation. Among our own people, eight or ten persons, during the following week, were found to be anxiously inquiring for the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward; weeping Marys and bold young men, startled from the grave of trespasses and sins. The whole winter proved to be a 'day of the right hand of the Most High.' There was murmuring, indeed, lest the young minister *should carry things too far;* and there was open hostility. Nor were there wanting serious and conscientious apprehensions on the part of some of my honoured brethren in the ministry, lest the work should savour more of fanaticism than sober thought, and ultimately show that it was the result of overheated and practised mechanism, rather than the work of God. But they were good men, and soon saw that their apprehensions were groundless. Amidst the greatest seriousness there was no outbreak, and no disorder of any kind. The sacred influence was silent as the dew of heaven. There was PRAYER. There was solemn and earnest preaching. There was frequent pastoral visitation. There were private circles for religious conversation, and prayer, and praise, and these scarcely known beyond the individuals who composed them. There were no 'new measures,' no 'anxious seats,' and no public announcement of the names or the number of those who were striving to enter into the strait gate. Yet there were unexpected and unthought-of instances of seriousness among the gay and frivolous, in the families of the rich and the poor, among the moral and immoral, and many were the triumphs of victorious grace.

"*The third Thursday of January*, by a private arrangement, was set apart by about thirty members of the church as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer. It was at a private house

in Church street, just in the rear of St. Paul's; and such a day I never saw before, and have never seen since. Such self-abasement, such confession of sin, such earnestness and importunity in prayer, and such hope in God's almightiness, I have rarely witnessed. And what deserves to be recorded is, that as the devotions of the day were drawing to a close, there was a *strong and confident expectation* that the Holy Spirit was about largely to descend upon the people. And so it was. He was even then descending. That cry: 'Where is thy hand, even thy right hand? Pluck it out of thy bosom,' was heard in heaven, and echoed by our great High Priest. A delightful impulse was given to the work by this day of prayer. The promise was made good, 'Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear.'

"Our weekly lecture occurred on the evening of the same day; and I may say, it was the most solemn service of my ministry. The subject of the lecture was, 'Marvel not that I said unto you, Ye must be born again.' God was with the hearers and the preacher; his Spirit moved them as 'the trees of the wood are moved with the wind.' There is good reason to believe that *more than one hundred persons* were deeply impressed with their lost condition as sinners, and their need of an interest in Christ, on that evening. It was not then with us as it is now. *Now* few attend our weekly lectures except the professed people of God; *then* the impenitent rushed to the house of prayer. Enemies were silenced; members of other churches came among us, some to spy out our liberty, and some to mark the character of the work for themselves, and all classes were constrained to confess, 'This is the finger of God.' Between one and two hundred attended the private meetings for religious instruction, and great solemnity pervaded the whole people. The work was rapid; awakening and conviction in many instances so short that older Christians began to doubt its genuineness. Yet some of the brightest and most enduring Christians among us were those whose conversion was as sudden as that of Saul of Tarsus. The gathered fruits of this protracted harvest were rich; consisting sometimes of thirty and forty, and at one communion season more than seventy, filling

the broad aisle of the church—a lovely spectacle to God, angels, and men." *Id.* 166—8.

May such gracious and glorious visitations be multiplied in all our churches until all flesh shall see the salvation of God. May the ministers, office-bearers, and private Christians, incessantly labour and pray for these outpourings, even the great rain of God's strength. And may the remembrance of these years of God's right hand quicken the zeal of God's people to promote his work.

Before proceeding to set forth the theological import of this work, we take occasion to say that the chapter of "Affecting Incidents," and the account of the religious experience of his daughter, Mary Norris, are not only graphic and interesting, but they are highly instructive and edifying—as far as they go, quite akin to the celebrated "Pastor's Sketches," of the late Dr. Spencer. There is also much epistolary matter between the author and distinguished correspondents, such as Drs. Miller, Emmons, Stuart, Richards, Humphrey, and his honoured parents, which is valuable and interesting. In regard to Missions, Domestic and Foreign, it is only necessary to say that while he was among the founders or earliest supporters of the American Board of Foreign Missions, and the American Home Missionary Society, and was never otherwise than friendly to them, he nevertheless became an earnest supporter of the Boards of our own church; in these matters, being at once a loyal and a catholic Presbyterian.

The theological interest of these volumes arises from the author's early Hopkinsian training; his consequent difficulties in coming among the old Calvinists of the Presbytery of New York; his uncompromising aversion to the New Haven Theology; and the gradual modification of his views, till the shades of difference between them and Old Calvinism are altogether slight, almost imperceptible. In this connection, we feel bound to signalize one noble trait of character, which is as conspicuous in Dr. Spring, as it is deficient in many, if not in most, good and great men. We refer to the candour with which, while remarkable for independence, firmness, and freedom from fickleness, he has opened his mind to new light in correction of his past opinions, and to his ingenuous acknowledgment of

any errors of opinion or conduct, of which he has thus become convinced. We see much in these volumes to bear out and illustrate the following statement of the venerable author:

"*Truth* has been my object, the truth as God has revealed it in his word. I never, consciously, had any reluctance to abandon a wrong view because I had long cherished it, nor to adopt different views because they countervailed my former opinions. I have often thought that if men of different theological sentiments, but of fair and ingenuous minds, would prosecute their inquiries under the impression that they are equally interested in ascertaining the truth, and that nothing is gained, but much is lost, by their adherence to error, there would be very little religious controversy." Vol. i. p. 106.

We shall see illustrations of this in the author's doctrinal opinions. But there is one instance, of a practical kind, so marked as to deserve particular notice. In the height of the controversy about Taylorism, Dr. Spring, being in New Haven, was invited to preach in the College chapel. He had a discourse on "Native Depravity," antagonistic to Dr. Taylor's views, which Dr. Nettleton had listened to in the Brick church with great approbation. He hesitated about preaching it in the chapel upon "so courteous an invitation." Upon the somewhat wavering advice of Dr. Thomas H. Skinner, he at length concluded to preach it. Of course, it gave great offence, and made no little stir. "And," says Dr. Spring, who might have omitted all reference to the matter whatever, "I much doubt the propriety of so doing, nor do I now judge that I was prompted to do it by the meekness of wisdom." A like magnanimous change of front was shown by him in reference to the proposed new version of the Bible by the Bible Society.

Dr. Spring repeatedly assures us that he "did not adopt the *peculiarities* of Hopkinsianism" in his early ministry. And speaking of the present time he assures us, "I am no enemy to Hopkinsianism, though I have no fellowship with its peculiarities." Vol. ii. p. 15. What he means by this, more fully appears in the following passage:

"We have no sympathy with the two peculiarities of Hopkinsianism. The position that *God is the author of sin*, and the doctrine of *unconditional submission* to the will of God, as ex-

plained by Hopkinsians, and enforced by a willingness to be damned for his glory, as essential to true piety, appear to me to have been inconsiderately adopted. I myself was early educated in this belief, but, with all reverence for my early training, I could not retain it in my creed. Many are the discussions on these subjects I have listened to when under my father's roof, and I shall never forget the impression made upon my mind by listening to the outline of a discourse upon the words, 'The wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain.' The *doctrine* of the discourse was, *There is no more sin in the world than God wants.* Though I was but a boy, the thought struck me painfully. My father disapproved of it, though he smiled; I felt it could not be true. Many a time has the thought occurred to my mind, that if God is the efficient cause of all the sin in the world, then is he the author of much more sin than holiness. I cannot believe it. . . . In regard to a *conditional consent to be damned*, even if the hypothesis it involves be admissible, I have no confidence in it as a practical test of Christian character. The strong attachment to a particular system of theology, and the deceitfulness of the human heart, are too operative to allow any man to trust himself with such a test of character. . . . It is *absurd* because it makes the Christian character an absurdity. . . . To be willing to be damned, is to be willing to sin and suffer eternally. . . . Is it possible for a good man to consent to such a perfect abandonment to all wickedness?" Vol. ii. pp. 10, 11, 12.

The author's theological attitude at the beginning of his ministry, called forth the celebrated polemical work, entitled the *Contrast*, by the Rev. Ezra Stiles Ely, in which the Hopkinsian peculiarities, and some exaggerations and caricatures of them disowned by many of its adherents, and emphatically by Dr. Spring, were set in offensive and disparaging contrast with old Calvinism. Dr. Spring's course was eminently wise, and might well be imitated by many others in like circumstances. "I had no other way of quieting the alarm excited by the 'Contrast,' than by preaching the truth as it is in Jesus, and more plainly and pungently. This I was enabled to do. . . God's Spirit came down, and in a succession of outpourings . . .

enlarged, and beautified, and perpetuated the church, and gave it a name among the more useful and honoured churches of the land." Vol. i. pp. 129—31.

The conflict related mainly to the doctrines of original sin, human ability, and the extent of the atonement. Dr. Romeyn, in behalf of himself and other members of Presbytery who stood in doubt of him, presented to him twelve written questions, which he explicitly answered in writing: and then three supplementary questions arising out of three of his answers to the first series of interrogatories, which he also explicitly answered. This appears to have nearly or quite terminated the difficulties between Dr. Spring and his co-presbyters, growing out of this conflict. "On the subject of atonement, Dr. Romeyn, and the brethren in whose behalf he addressed me, were satisfied, and the controversy ended." The result of the whole was, that Dr. Spring's doctrine and that of his brethren might be summed up in the formula, that Christ's atonement is "sufficient for the whole world, efficient only for the elect," for whose sure salvation it was designed and provided.

In regard to ability, and particularly the distinction between natural and moral ability and inability, the author says: "I have never changed my views on this subject; but I have modified my statements, and, as I think, more in accordance with the word of God. The distinction is valuable; and though I do not now say that the sinner can repent *if he will*, because the assertion implies that an unholy volition produces holiness, yet I still maintain that his duty stands abreast with his intellectual powers, and his faculty of moral discernment. . . Those pulpits which teach that it is impossible for the unrenewed man to repent and believe the gospel, rarely urge this duty upon the impenitent, and never with the earnestness with which it is urged in the word of God. No man is required to perform *impossibilities*, nor is there any impossibility in the case, except that which arises from unmingled wickedness, and which leaves the sinner without excuse. . . . God makes no allowance for a wicked inability. . . In view of their perception, their reason, and their conscience, impenitent men *can*, and in view of their unconquerable depravity, they *cannot*, repent and believe the gospel." *Id.* pp. 136—7.

Although the author has corrected some of his earlier modes of statement on this subject, there is still a tinge of them left in those phrases which, after asserting a real, sinful, inexcusable inability, seem to assert that, in any view, the unregenerate "*can* repent and believe the gospel," by any power of their own. That this inability consists in a sinful moral state, not in the want of natural faculties which would suffice for all rectitude, if their sinful state were removed, is undeniable, and admitted by all. But then it is a real inability. The sinful heart cannot make itself holy. Depravity cannot eradicate itself. The dead soul cannot make itself alive. This Dr. Spring insists on. If then sinners cannot, on account of their depravity, make themselves new creatures, in what way, or by what powers, can they do it? And, if they have no power by which they can do it, although they have all power for all duty, if this sinful and inexcusable inability were removed, why say that, so long as this remains, they have anything that really amounts to the power requisite and adequate to the doing of it? Dr. Spring, in various phrase, states his belief in everything that we hold on this subject. And this seems to us inconsistent with anything that can properly be called ability in the sinner to anything spiritually good, or accompanying salvation.

In regard to "principle and exercise," he prints *inter alia*, a letter from Dr. Emmons, in which that acute reasoner says, "I suppose that perception, reason, conscience, memory, and volition, constitute the essence of the human mind; and I cannot conceive of any *substratum* in which these mental properties exist." In regard to this whole subject Dr. Spring says very frankly and explicitly:

"I have never entered deeply into this question. That fallen man is responsible for his sinful *nature* as well as his sinful *acts*, I have not a doubt. Did I not believe this, I should be driven to the conclusion that God is the author of sin. As the judicial visitation for Adam's first sin, the native tendencies of the race are to evil and not to good. I never was an acute metaphysician, and I am too old to attempt to become so now. Yet I cannot help thinking, though I once thought otherwise, that there is something in man's moral character besides the acts of the will. Are not love, hatred, hope, fear, the spon-

taneous acts of the mind, instead of being produced by any efficient acts of the will? Is not their moral character derived from the character of the mind or heart from which they flow? The tree is known by its fruits. Is it not the heart that gives character to its exercises, rather than its exercises that gives character to the heart? Do effects produce their causes, or do causes produce their effects? 'Keep *thy heart* with all diligence, for *out of it* are the issues of life.' Evil things come from *within*, and good things come from *within*. My own consciousness teaches me that there is something that lies deeper than the acts of my will." *Id.* pp. 158—9.

Dr. Spring says, that with respect to original sin, the difference "between old Calvinists and Hopkinsians is two-fold. Hopkinsians regard this arrangement in respect to the imputation of Adam's sin as simply a procedure of *sovereignty*, while the old Calvinists regard it as a measure of moral *government*. I once thought it was a procedure of mere sovereignty, but on more full examination of the language of the apostle, '*judgment* was by one to *condemnation*,' I became convinced that it was a procedure of moral government, and a judicial decision. *Judgment* and *condemnation* refer to judicial rather than to sovereign acts."

"The other point of difference relates to *mediate* or *immediate* imputation." Vol. ii. pp. 7, 8. Dr. Spring then goes on to argue at some length in favour of mediate imputation. We have no space to follow or examine his reasonings. The contrary view is so clearly asserted above, when he says, "as the judicial visitation for Adam's sin, the native tendencies of our race are to evil and not to good," that nothing more requires to be said on the subject.

The author, while discarding the offensive peculiarities of Hopkinsianism, quite naturally seeks to present the whole system, (not for the errors, but for the great amount of scriptural and Calvinistic truth it contains), and especially its advocates, in a favourable light. Doubtless, estimates of it must vary according to the light in which it was viewed; first, according as it is viewed with reference to the errors, or the truths it contained; secondly, according to the degree in which its peculiarities were developed and pushed to extremes in the persons

of its various adherents, embracing, as they did, men who, like Dr. Woods and Dr. Spring, never diverged widely from that old Calvinism which they more and more closely approximated through life, down to the school of Emmons, teaching that the soul is only a chain of exercises, and those exercises, alike the sinful and the holy, the immediate work of God. Says Dr. Spring, "the late Dr. Miller, of Princeton, once remarked to me, 'I should hesitate to lay hands on Dr. Emmons; but, though I do not approve of all Dr. Hopkins has written, I would ordain any man, otherwise qualified, who could honestly say, that he believed every word of Dr. Hopkins's system.'" *Id.* p. 6.

Dr. Spring was, as is well understood, opposed to the Dissolution of the Four Synods, and some other antecedent measures, which issued in the disruption of the Presbyterian Church. He belonged to the class who believed that the heresies and disorders which led to them, might have been surmounted with less violent remedies, while, as we have already seen, he, especially thirty years ago, adhered less closely than some to every one of the *ipsissima verba* of the Confession of Faith. His attitude on these subjects is sufficiently apparent in the following language:

"I love the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian church, and always loved it. I have not altered in my preaching; my publications speak for themselves. I do not concur in all the peculiarities of old Calvinism, nor did I ever; nor do I with any of the New Haven Theology. If I must choose between old Calvinism and the New Haven Theology, give me old Calvinism. Old-fashioned Calvinists and old-fashioned Hopkinsians are not far apart: the more closely they are united in opposing modern errors, the better. These sentiments were uttered more than thirty years ago." Vol. i. p. 271.

Dr. Spring makes some noteworthy memoranda regarding the founding of Andover Seminary, in which his father had a leading part. Some letters from Dr. Woods to his father, here first published, put it beyond doubt, that Dr. Woods was a moderate Hopkinsian, and under pledges to the Hopkinsians when appointed to the Chair of Theology at Andover. He was to teach Hopkinsianism, but so prudently as not to alarm or

rouse into opposition the old Calvinists. He, however, himself gradually, as he advanced in life, "sustained a change in favour of the Calvinism of the Westminster Assembly," as abundantly appears from his writings. It still further appears, that, according to the constitution of that Seminary, its professors as well as its students may be either Presbyterians or Congregationalists; while some of the more rigid Independents were at one time disposed to force their own ecclesiastical polity exclusively upon the institution.

Dr. Spring has two chapters on the Southern rebellion, and its suppression. His indignant and eloquent denunciations of this mad and wicked insurrection are well known. It is unnecessary to repeat them, or to repeat the discussion concerning the propriety of making a declaration to that effect by the Assembly of 1861. But we wish to record on our pages his sentiments on two subjects growing out of the rebellion, which are now of deepest concern to us—sentiments which seem to us to be alike the dictates of Christian wisdom and love. The first respects the spirit to be cherished towards the conquered.

"But our nationality is saved, and we can afford to be magnanimous. While I hope that the leaders of the rebellion will be for ever disfranchised, I still hope that, in the exercise of a sound discretion, the Government will see fit to extend to them all the lenity which is consistent with the welfare of the nation. Times have altered; the South has altered; the spirit of the North has altered; there has been suffering enough; no man calls for blood now. Our 'erring sisters' have seen their error, and all we ask of them is to return to their first love. One thing is obvious, and that is, if we remain a prosperous, peaceful, and happy people, *we must treat our Southern friends with kindness.* The demon of secession cast out and purged of slavery, we ask of them nothing but loyalty and confidence." Vol. ii. p. 214.

He gives the following judgment as to the political status and franchises of the freedmen:

"There is one thought on the subject of slavery, which I may not omit. Utterly rejecting the doctrine of human servitude, or the right of property and ownership in man, I would not be in haste to elevate the coloured race to a position for

which they are not fitted. I would not, from an enthusiastic attachment to 'liberty and equality,' violently thrust them into offices of trust and responsibility, or give them the elective franchise, until they are prepared for it. Their own welfare, and the safety of our own institutions, would, in my judgment, be imperilled by such a policy. I would make them *free*, but I would treat them as servants, and just as I would treat the white races from abroad, and in our own land, who seek and are fitted for no higher position. Let them go when and where they will, and enjoy all the protection of law; let them serve whom they will, and in the capacity which they themselves may select, and receive recompense for their labours; but let them not aspire to a seat on the bench, nor to the pulpit, *until their intellectual culture and moral qualifications shall have fitted them for these responsible positions.* 'Wisdom is justified of her children:' the results will show that this is the true policy towards the coloured race. When *Christian* men and women are found among them, I would treat them with Christian love, which is 'without partiality and without hypocrisy.' I would treat them as 'Paul the aged' would have Philemon treat Onesimus, not as 'a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved.' I would not assign to them the lowest place at the communion table, nor the highest, but a place where they are acknowledged as brethren and sisters in Christ." Vol. ii. pp. 202, 203.

We here take leave of the patriarchal counsels, records, and testimonies which the venerable author has embalmed in these volumes. Our remarks have necessarily been as discursive as the topics brought under review in such an autobiography. We sincerely rejoice that the author has been spared to prepare this memorial of himself, and these contributions to the ecclesiastical history of his times.

SHORT NOTICES.

Essays on the Supernatural in Christianity, with Special Reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tubingen School. By Rev. George P. Fisher, M. A., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

The current objections to supernaturalism, *i. e.*, to Christianity itself, as they have been voiced by Strauss, Baur, Renan, and Theodore Parker, are very ably handled in this volume. The author constantly betrays the scholarship, culture, metaphysical and theological insight, together with the judicial mind, which the proper execution of the task he has undertaken requires. We are glad to observe that he finds the true secret of incorrigible Rationalism and Scepticism in an inadequate sense of sin, and consequent inadequate appreciation of supernatural deliverance from it, of which disease Divine illumination is the only adequate cure. He also has penetrated and grasped the true nature, not only of Pantheism and Positivism in general, but of the collateral and subordinate issues implicated with them and supernaturalism. The book is a decidedly valuable contribution to what is now a most important side of Christian apologetics.

History of Rationalism; embracing a Survey of the Present State of Protestant Theology. By the Rev. John F. Hurst, A. M. With Appendix of Literature. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

This work deals with Rationalism historically. After quoting various definitions of it from different writers, the author proceeds to test it by its fruits, as shown in its history, in which he comes down to the more prominent rationalistic sects of our own time, not excluding those of our own country. He thus proves that, while Rationalism has indirectly led to a revision of the doctrines and defences of Christianity that has freed them from erroneous and enfeebling modes of presentation, its direct fruits have been anti-religious, corrupting, and demoralizing. This book is likewise a valuable addition to the Christian armory.

History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe. By the Rev. W. E. H. Leckey, M. A. In two volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

We have here another able and elaborate treatise on Rationalism. But its tone and scope are quite opposite to the two published by the Messrs. Scribner, which we have just noticed. The author is in full sympathy with rationalizing tendencies, and a decided enemy of Christian orthodoxy. His sceptical views have a strong tinge of Positivism, and are utterly one-sided and destructive. We are more brief in our notices of these important works, as we hope in our next number to treat at length of the great subject they discuss.

History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude, M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Volumes III. and IV. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1865.

The character of the first two volumes of this work, which we noticed when they appeared, is maintained in these. This history is copious and minute, and sheds a light on the interior history of the Reformation and Reformation-period in England, which is not easily accessible elsewhere.

The Structure of Animal Life; Six Lectures delivered at the Brooklyn Academy of Music in January and February, 1862. By Louis Agassiz, Professor of Zoölogy and Geology in the Lawrence Scientific School. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

Whatever comes from Agassiz, in his own department, will of course command great attention and respect. This work is no exception. Besides the zoölogical and scientific knowledge, which it so vividly and lucidly imparts, the truths of science are presented in their relations to Theism. Professor Agassiz finds in the several animal species evidence of the forth-putting of a distinct Intelligent and Almighty Creative Power. We count the distinguished author a much safer guide here, than in regard to the unity of our race. The volume is a beautiful specimen of typography and pictorial illustration.

Elements of Political Economy. By Arthur Latham Perry, Professor of History and Political Economy in Williams College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

Professor Perry is a vigorous thinker, a clear and forcible writer. Political economy in his hands is freshly, yet thoroughly and judiciously treated, and in a form not ill-suited to the class-room. Many subjects of present interest in the legislation of our country are discussed by him in a manner which leads us to wish that our legislators would master his book. We do not, however, intend by this to endorse all his opinions.

Children in Heaven, or the Infant Dead Redeemed by the Blood of Jesus, with Words of Consolation to Bereaved Parents. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This beatifully printed and bound volume, prepared by the respected Secretary of the Board of Publication, is a copious treasury of gems, didactic, argumentative, persuasive, poetic, in regard to the salvation of the infant dead. They are from a large number of authors, and afford, as no other volume does, access to the most precious parts of the literature of the subject. Bereaved parents will find it a rich source of consolation.

Spiritualism Identical with Ancient Sorcery, New Testament Demonology, and Modern Witchcraft; with the Testimony of God and Man against it. By W. McDonald. New York: Carlton & Porter.

This book grew out of a Dissertation read before two associations of Methodist ministers in New England, who requested its publication. Before it got through the press, it expanded to quite a volume, which the title-page correctly describes. The book is timely and important. The description, or rather the authenticated facts, which it gives, showing the disastrous effects of this delusion, have a melancholy interest and value. We are inclined to concur with the author's main doctrines, viz., that the only spirits concerned in spiritualism are fallen angels; that it is identical with ancient sorcery and demonology; and that whatever phenomena may be accounted for by jugglery or sleight-of-hand, no theory of modern spiritualism is adequate which separates it wholly from diabolism.

The Shepherd and his Flock: or the Keeper of Israel, and the Sheep of his Pasture. By J. R. McDuff, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1866.

Bible Blessings. By the Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1866.

These are evangelical and interesting books, by authors well known, and of that wholesome kind to which the publications of the Carters usually belong.

The Laws of Thought, Objective and Subjective. By Alexander Robertson. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green. 1864.

It might be conjectured from this title, that it is designed to indicate a treatise on Logic. We find, however, that it relates to Ethics, and attempts to give the Laws of Thought relative to this great science, or a kind of Organon for its due investigation. It is a brief treatise, and discarding Utilitarianism and other schemes, comes to build on the Scriptures as the true standard of moral duty and authority in ethical principles.

Vital Godliness: a Treatise on Experimental and Practical Piety. By William S. Plumer, D.D., LL.D. Published by the American Tract Society.

There is no subject on which Dr. Plumer writes better than on experimental religion. Few men can write more to the purpose on this subject than he. In this volume he goes through all the stages of vital godliness, from the first awakening that precedes conversion, till he portrays successively the several Christian graces. The impenitent, the awakened, the new convert, the doubting Christian, the afflicted, the backslider, the tempted, the strong and assured believer, may all gather light and strength from this treatise.

While They are with Us.

Wee Davie. By Norman McLeod, D.D.

The Titles, Attributes, Work, and Claims of the Holy Spirit, according to the Scripture.

Individualized Religion, as Related to the Power and Prosperity of the Church. By William Adams, D.D.

The Power of Truth. By Rev. John Gray.

How George Neumark sung his Hymn for the Church of Christ. From Guthrie's Sunday Magazine.

The above are recent publications of the American Tract Society. They are excellent of their kind. The last is one of the most precious tracts we have ever read. Dr. Adams's discourse especially, is of great value, and should be widely circulated.

Fonthill Recreations. The Mediterranean Islands: Sketches and Stories of their Scenery, Customs, History, Painters, &c. By M. G. Sleeper, author of "Pictures from the History of the Swiss," &c. With Illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1866.

No better description of this book can be given than that furnished by this title-page. We will only add, that in drawing these sketches the author appears to hold a facile and graphic pen, and to present vivid and readable portraitures.

The Works of Philip Lindsley, D.D., formerly Vice-President and President Elect of the College of New Jersey, Princeton; and late President of the University of Nashville, Tennessee. Edited by Le Roy J. Halsey, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the North-west. With Introductory Notices of his Life and Labours, by the Editor. Vol. I. Educational Discourses, pp. 648. Vol. II. Sermons and Religious Discourses, pp. 720. Vol. III. Miscellaneous Discourses and Essays, pp. 731. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866.

The writer of this notice was three years under the instruction of Dr. Lindsley in the College of New Jersey, and twenty years his fellow-townsman. He is one of the numerous body

of those still living, who cherish his memory with affectionate regard, not only because of his talents, learning, and devotion to the cause of education, but because of the personal benefits and manifestations of kindness received at his hands. Dr. Lindsley's bearing and manners were imposing, yet being connected with a free and sociable disposition, they secured the respect, without exciting the fear of his pupils. He always magnified his office. To be an educator, and especially an educator in the department of the Classics, was his pride and delight. He successfully endeavoured to impress upon his students a measure of his own sense of the importance of the work in which he was engaged. His zeal led to untiring efforts, not only in acquiring learning, and in teaching, but in his attempts to arouse and enlighten the public mind as to the importance of large and liberal plans of culture. It was to this end he principally devoted his energies; and these large and elegant volumes contain abundant evidence of the ability and varied learning, as well as zeal, which he brought to bear upon his object. Few men of the passing generation have been so useful in the cause of liberal education, and a lasting debt of gratitude is due for his distinguished services. Dr. Lindsley's friends and the public are under great obligations to the Rev. Dr. Halsey for the manner in which he has discharged his duties as editor. He has erected an elegant and lasting monument to the memory of his friend.

Primeval Symbols; or, The Analogy of Creation and New-Creation. By William Fetherston H. Barrister-at-Law, formerly Scholar, Gold Medalist, Mathematical and Ethical Moderator, and Hebrew Prizeman, of Trinity College, Dublin. Dublin: Hodges, Smith & Co., 104 Grafton street.

The design of this work, as the title imports, is to trace the analogy between the six-days of creation and the new-creation effected by the Spirit of God. The natural state of man, since the fall, is dark and chaotic; from without, and not from within, by the immediate power of God, light begins to dawn, and with light struggle and conflict; on the second day, from within, but still by Divine power, the atmosphere is developed, which gradually lifts the dense dark clouds from the surface of the waters, and prepares the earth to bring forth its fruits. This idea is carried out ingeniously, with much spirituality, and with the aid of a cultivated and well-informed mind. The writer shows himself to be a devout Christian, a decided Augustinian or Calvinist, and yet on points not immediately connected with practical religion, he departs not only from the Augustinian scheme, but from the common faith of the church.

For example, while holding to the strict idea of a creation *ex nihilo*, he assumes that there has always been a universe. Our globe, and system, are comparatively recent affairs, but from eternity God has had a universe for the exercise and revelation of his power. This anti-scriptural doctrine is assumed simply because he cannot otherwise answer the question, What was God doing from eternity before he created the world? He is well aware that this difficulty is purely subjective, that the question has no meaning in its relation to a Being with whom there is no before and no after. This satisfies him when he speaks of God's foreordination, but not when he treats of creation. Another example of his departure from the common faith, is his maintaining that those who do not hear the gospel in this life will receive its offers after death. This he endeavours to prove from Scripture, but advances nothing which has not often before been presented, and which by the church, as a whole, has been pronounced unsatisfactory. With these drawbacks, the book is one to be read with profit and delight.

The Centenary of American Methodism: a Sketch of its History, Theology, Practical System, and Success. Prepared by order of the Centenary Committee of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Abel Stevens, LL.D. With a Statement of the Plan of the Centenary Celebration of 1866, by John McClintock, D.D. New York: Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry street. 1866. Pp. 287.

The American Methodists propose to celebrate, in the year 1866, the completion of the first great cycle of their history, its centenary jubilee. In answer to the question, What entitles Methodism to this solemn, this national commemoration? Dr. Stevens, the able and accomplished historian of this branch of the church, has prepared this volume to show, What Methodism is; What it has achieved that commends it to such general and grateful recognition; and, What are its capabilities for the future, and the consequent responsibilities of its people. This task he has well accomplished. The volume before us is a compact, authentic, and therefore, most convenient, compend of the history, the theology, the practical system, and working of this remarkable organization. Methodists have undoubtedly a wonderful record. The census of their church for 1864 reports nine hundred and eight thousand eight hundred and nine members and probationers; five thousand seven hundred and forty-three preachers; nearly ten thousand churches; church property to the value of between twenty-six and twenty-seven millions of dollars; and eight hundred and fifty-three thousand four hundred and seventy-one Sunday-school scholars. They

report also twenty-three colleges, two biblical institutes, and seventy-seven seminaries, female colleges, and academies.

A Highland Parish. By Rev. Norman Macleod, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 318.

"The sketches and stories that compose this volume are selected from Dr. Macleod's 'Reminiscences of a Highland Parish.' Those who feel an interest in a remarkable people who are rapidly passing away, will read these truthful sketches and simple tales with great delight, while such as have witnessed scenes akin to those described, will acknowledge that the pictures are drawn by a master-hand." From what we have read of this volume, we judge the above to be a fair estimate of its character. The Highlanders are indeed a remarkable people. "The one island of Skye," says the author, "has sent forth from her wild shores since the beginning of the last wars of the French Revolution, twenty-one lieutenant and major-generals, forty-eight lieutenant-colonels, six hundred commissioned officers, ten thousand soldiers, four governors of colonies, one governor-general, one adjutant-general, one chief baron of England, and one judge of the Supreme Court of Scotland. I remember," he adds, "the names of sixty-one officers being enumerated, who during the war had joined the army and navy, from farms which were visible from one hill-top in the parish."

Sermons and Expositions. By the late John Robertson, D.D., Glasgow Cathedral. With a Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. J. G. Young, Monifieth. Alexander Strahan, Publisher, London and New York. 1865. Pp. 306.

Dr. Robertson was born in 1824 and died in 1865, before the completion of his forty-first year. He was educated at St. Andrews, and studied for the ministry in St. Mary's Hall. He was so distinguished for his attainments and abilities during the whole course of his academic training, that the highest expectations were entertained of his success in the ministry. These expectations were not disappointed. He was settled first over a rural parish, and afterwards in the Cathedral church, Glasgow. In both places he secured the respect and confidence of the people in a high degree. He seems to have been a zealous pastor, fertile in devising schemes for the moral and religious improvement of the sixteen thousand souls committed to his charge in Glasgow. His labours were too great for his impaired health, and he sank in the prime of life. His sermons are simple, clear, and direct. They are entirely free from all attempts at display, and were evidently written to

make an impression of the truth on the minds of his hearers. The doctrine of the Divinity of Christ; of his expiatory sacrifice; of the corruption of our nature; of the absolute necessity of a supernatural influence of the Spirit, to regenerate the soul and to enable it to turn unto God, are clearly presented. Christ is made the only way of access to God, and his Spirit the only source of life, but he held that the benefits of his death and the saving power of his Spirit might be, and in many cases were, experienced by the heathen, who had never heard his name.

The Hebrew Lawgiver. By John M. Lowrie, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian church, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street. Vol. I. pp. 288; Vol. II. pp. 353.

This work is not designed as an exposition of the Mosaic institutions, nor as a vindication of the authenticity and inspiration of the Pentateuch, although these important topics are not overlooked. It relates to the personal history of Moses; and consists of a series of discourses, or chapters, on the great events of his life. The book is written in a clear and familiar style, and not only tends to elucidate a most important period of the history of the church, but to bring out the great lessons taught by the events of which it treats. We doubt not it will prove an acceptable and useful contribution to the religious literature of our church.

The Life of the Rev. Robert Baird, D.D. By his son, Henry M. Baird, Professor in the University of the City of New York. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, No. 770 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 347.

Few men of the passing generation have been more prominently before the public than the late Dr. Baird; and few have been more eminently useful. From the time he was licensed to preach the gospel, he devoted himself with intelligent zeal to promote the cause of Christian education, of temperance, and of the evangelization of the people included in the decayed churches of the old world. In the prosecution of this work he travelled all over the United States and Europe; almost living, for years, on the road or on the sea. His courteous manners, the conspicuous purity of his motives, and his persevering zeal, gained him access to the highest classes of society in Europe, and enabled him to accomplish results which few men would have ventured to attempt. His son has done a good work in putting on record the simple facts of the useful life of his revered parent.

The Tabernacle; or, The Gospel according to Moses. By George Junkin, D.D., LL.D., late President of Washington College, Virginia. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 166.

This volume exhibits in a clear light the well-known characteristics of its venerable author. It has his vivacity, his point, his fertility of imagination, his unwavering confidence in the truth of what he teaches, and the wonderful power which his imagination and feelings have over his convictions. "This tiny book," he says, "is a compend of Christian theology. I say *Christian* theology; for I have, long ago, been forced into the conviction that without a diligent study of the tabernacle, no man ever acquires clear, transparent, and practical views of evangelical truth in systematic order."

Man and the Gospel. By Thomas Guthrie, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 455.

Dr. Guthrie's name is a passport. Any book from his pen is sure to command readers. This volume, the title of which is too general to reveal definitely its nature, is a series of discourses on the bearing of the gospel on man in the varied circumstances of his life; in trial, in temptation, in childhood; in his relations to the poor, to society generally, to Christ and futurity. It will sustain the reputation which its author has already so richly earned.

The Word. Walks from Eden. By the author of the "Wide Wide World." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1866. Pp. 426.

This is another book whose title needs explanation. By the "Word" is meant Christ; and by "Walks from Eden" are intended a chronological survey, from the beginning onward, of striking facts and incidents in the early history of our race. The design of the author is to gather from the discoveries of travellers and science, whatever may tend to illustrate the sacred narrative, and especially to show how everything converges towards Christ, the centre of the whole system of Providence. The present volume continues the review to the time of Abraham and his sons. A second on the Old Testament, and the first volume of the life of Christ are in preparation.

The Resurrection of Christ historically and logically reviewed. By Richard W. Dickinson, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 142.

The design of this work is to embody the facts and testimony in relation to the resurrection of our Lord; vindicate the credibility of the witnesses; rebut the positions, and expose

the sophistries of infidelity. As the resurrection of Christ is the central fact of our religion, that on which the validity of the whole gospel depends, the exhibition of the evidence on which the truth of that fact rests, and a refutation of the objections of infidels, must be a service acceptable to all Christian people. It is a service which needs to be often rendered; not only because new objections are from time to time presented, but also because the books of a former generation are often inaccessible to the mass of readers of succeeding times. We think, therefore, that Dr. Dickinson has put his time and talents to a valuable use in preparing this comprehensive discussion of the subject.

Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law. By Edward Burk, of the Suffolk Bar. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard & Co. 1866. Pp. 310.

The relation of the church to the state in New England, and specially in Massachusetts, and the consequences of that relation, form an interesting chapter in American history. Upon this subject this volume throws a clear light, and will on that account be welcomed by a large class of readers.

Jehovah-Jireh: a Treatise on Divine Providence. By William S. Plumer, D. D., LL.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. Pp. 233.

This is a practical and devotional, rather than a theological work. It presents one of the most important of the doctrines of natural and revealed religion in a manner adapted to edify and comfort the people of God.

The Daily Public School in the United States. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. Pp. 158.

The writer of this pamphlet has devoted forty years of his life to the intelligent prosecution of the cause of education. No man in the country is better entitled to be heard on that subject. His views are the result of long experience and of extended observation. With some of them we may not agree, as we cannot but recognize it as the duty of the state not only to educate the young, but to provide the means for rendering that education effectual. The establishment of normal schools, therefore, for training teachers, we regard as a legitimate object of state patronage. The amount of information and of wise suggestions contained in this volume, should commend it to the serious attention of the friends of education.

The Jewish Church in its Relations to the Jewish Nation and to the Gentiles; or the People of the Congregation in their relations to the People of the Land and to the Peoples of the Lands. By Rev. Samuel C. Kerr, M. A. Cincinnati. 1866. 16mo. Pp. 237.

This is certainly a very extraordinary book. Its author claims to have discovered that the Israelitish church and nation were not coextensive, as has always been supposed hitherto; but the church was simply the body of regenerate persons comprising the truly pious of the nation. The reasons urged in support of this novel theory, which is at variance with uniform scriptural representation, with tradition, and with the universal belief of both Jews and Christians, are, so far as we can gather them from the confused and repetitious manner in which they are stated, the five following:

1. The word קָהָל *congregation*, is in the Septuagint rendered *ἐκκλησία church*, p. 26; whence it is inferred that this term is more limited in its application than the people or nation of Israel. This proceeds, of course, on the tacit assumption of a false definition of the visible church; that it is not composed of those who profess the true religion with their children, but is "a separate body of true saints." (P. 156, comp. p. viii.) This modern idea of a small fragment of Christendom is transferred to the Old Testament, just as the American notion of the elective franchise and the appointment of civil officers by the people on p. 116. The author supposes himself to be erecting new and impregnable intrenchments in defence of pedobaptism, not perceiving that he has abandoned its citadel. Of course this imaginary distinction between the congregation and the people cannot be carried out. As a specimen of the absurdities to which it leads, we read, p. 121, "the expression *all the congregation* is not the equivalent of the expression *all the congregation of Israel.*"

2. The construction of the temple, p. 29. There was the court of the Gentiles, the court of the Jews, and the holy place, answering severally to foreign nations who had access to the first, to the Jewish nation who had access to the second, and (singularly enough) to the Jewish church or congregation who were *not* admitted to the third. One would think that the argument, so far as it had any force, lay in the opposite direction. Since no place was at the temple allotted to the church as distinguished from the nation, no such distinction existed, or was recognized there.

3. The proselyte system. And here we are treated to a rare collection of novelties, archæological, exegetical, and philological. No foreigner born outside of the jurisdiction of the

covenant people, it is alleged, p. 25, *et passim*, could under any circumstances be admitted to the Jewish church. And this in the face of the circumcision of Shechem and all the men of his city, (Gen. xxxiv. 24,) of the statement (Esth. viii. 17) that "many people of the land (of Persia) became Jews," of the mention (Neh. x. 28) of such as "had separated themselves from the people of the lands unto the law of God," immediately after the captivity; of the declaration (Matt. xxiii. 15) that the Pharisees "compassed sea and land" in their zeal to make proselytes, and of the well-known historical facts, to mention no others, of the enforced circumcision of the entire nations of the Idumeans and the Itureans, who had never set foot upon the soil of Palestine.

The sons of resident foreigners born in the holy land might, however, upon giving to the masters in Israel satisfactory evidence of regeneration, become members of the church. Pp. 36, 171. The proof of this lies in the talismanic words כִּי יָגוּר אִתְּךָ גֵּר Exod. xii. 48, which our poor unfortunate translators are soundly berated for having rendered according to their obvious and undoubted sense, "When a stranger shall sojourn with thee." Our author oracularly declares the meaning to be, "When a land-born shall be born again with thee," and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, etc. It is alleged that גֵּר must mean *one born in the land*, for no others could partake of the passover (according to the new doctrine). And this conclusion is held fast though Abraham will then declare, Gen. xxiii. 4, that he was born in Canaan, and Moses, Exod. ii. 22, that he was born in Midian, and Lev. xx. 2, will teach that the children of Israel and "land-borns born again," were alone punishable for giving their seed to Molech; foreign residents and their unregenerate descendants, it may be inferred, might do so with impunity. The signification *to be born again*, is attributed to יָגוּר because "in one instance, Num. xv. 14, it is rendered in the Septuagint *προσγένηται—πρὸς over and above*, and *γένηται to be born*." P. 34. "Donnegan or Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon," is referred to in proof, either of which would inform him that *προσγένηται* means no such thing. But whatever it may signify, יָגוּר means *to sojourn* or *dwell*, and can mean nothing else in such a connection. It might be vain to refer to commentaries and Hebrew lexicons, which are so contemptuously spoken of, p. 18, but the Bible and concordance will compel to the same conclusion.

It might seem to be difficult to reconcile with these new views of proselytism the directions, Gen. xvii. 12, Exod. xii. 44, to circumcise servants "bought with money of any stranger which is

not of thy seed," and to admit them to the passover. But nothing is easier; and these passages taken in connection with Lev. xxv. 44, afford an opportunity to do away with the impression hitherto well-nigh universal, that involuntary servitude existed among the patriarchs and in Israel. These servants could in no case be foreign born, p. 103, for none such were ever allowed to eat the passover (according to the new doctrine); for strangers we must therefore substitute their descendants. Moreover, they were not servants at all; for עֶבֶד is translated παῖς in the Septuagint, and παῖς sometimes means *son*, hence these were adopted sons. P. 185. They were children of unbelieving foreigners, who upon their conversion left their parents and sought admission to pious Israelitish families, where they were adopted. P. 166. And as to their being "bought with money," this simply means that they were "endowed" by some present made to them on their reception, or that some pecuniary recompense was made to their parents by the adopting father, just as a dowry was customarily given to the parents of a bride. P. 191. To what lengths will not men go, when they have a theory to sustain!

4. The word אֶזְרָח, or as it is spelled in this volume *azurah*, which might be thought a mere slip like "Melchisedeck" and "Elisha the Tishbite," p. 146, but for the uniformity with which it occurs. This term, which means simply a native Israelite, is in defiance of etymology, usage, and authority (including even his favourite Septuagint), translated "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," and this is arbitrarily assumed to mean one who belongs not only to the Hebrew nation, but to the Hebrew church. P. 108. The proof offered is the occurrence of the phrase, "native born among the children of Israel," in contrast with those of foreign descent. "If the Hebrew word *azurah*, which I render 'Hebrew of the Hebrews,' means home-born, as generally rendered, I ask who 'in Israel,' 'among the children of Israel,' 'among you,' were not home-born?" P. 107. It must, therefore, he argues, denote a class, and what class can it be but the members of the church as distinguished from the nation? "The *azurah* was a class among the children of Israel; or, in other words, there were two classes of the Jewish nation, so far as that nation was made up of the stock of Israel, viz., the *azurah* who was 'of the people of the congregation,' who was clean and ate the passover; and 'the Hebrew man thy brother,' who was only of the Hebrew nation, who was unclean and did not eat the passover, was only of 'the people of the land.' P. 108. It were idle to spend words in refutation of such an argument. We simply ask what is to be done with those numerous passages, in which גֵּר and אֶזְרָח are combined

to denote all who reside in the country, whether of foreign or native extraction, *e. g.*, Lev. xxiv. 16? or was blasphemy tolerated in those who were not members of the church?

5. The ecclesiastical penalties of temporary or permanent separation from the church. P. 127. The confusion of ideas, which the book betrays upon this subject, presents abundant matter for comment, in which we might indulge, if this notice were not already too long. To be unclean until even, or for a longer period, was not an ecclesiastical penalty. Ceremonial uncleanness is in the law carefully distinguished from sin. No one of its causes or occasions involved any act of sin. It might even arise from doing what duty required or the law itself prescribed, as the burial of the dead or the ceremonies connected with the red heifer or the day of atonement. It stands in no imaginable relation, therefore, to the suspension of an offender from church privileges. To be "cut off from among (מִקֶּרֶב) his people," is in defiance of lexicons and commentaries improved into "cut off from the drawing nigh of his people," p. 129, and this "is at least to be held as a heathen man," p. 130, the secret of which rendering is revealed on p. 15. He imagines that נָכְרִית in the phrase in question, is from the verb נָכַר, confounding Nun of the Niphal species with a radical letter, and to this he assigns the meaning "made a נָכְרִי, a foreigner"!

A Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes. By the Rev. Loyal Young, D. D. Presbyterian Board of Publication. 8vo. Pp. 276.

The perplexity which besets the study of Ecclesiastes, lies not so much in the obscurity or intrinsic difficulty of single passages as in its general plan and texture. The work of harmonizing all its parts and utterances into one consistent and connected whole, is attended with many and serious embarrassments. Hence the opinions entertained respecting its structure and design have varied more widely perhaps than in the case of any other book in the Bible. In the judgment of Dr. Young it is "a treatise on the question, what profit is there in this life, if there is no other? and this question is preparatory to the great doctrine of a future life, and a future judgment." He accordingly finds in it "an argument for a God, for immortality, for a future reward." The exposition, though warped in some instances, by the assumption of this governing idea, is in the main sound and judicious. The practical reflections, to which considerable space is devoted, are good and appropriate. We trust that this volume will have the effect of directing increased attention to a portion of Scripture which is too often neglected or undervalued.

The Life of John Brainerd, the brother of David Brainerd, and his successor as Missionary to the Indians of New Jersey. Par nobile fratrum. By Rev. Thomas Brainerd, D. D. Philadelphia.

A valuable addition to the stores of religious biography. Although the author gives various reasons why he should be comfortably independent of public opinion, approval should not be withheld from the work for its own sake. It is full of interesting information touching early missionary effort on behalf of the Indians; and of Christian life and culture in this country one hundred and twenty or thirty years ago. Although in a few instances indulging in phraseology perhaps a little overstrained, it is well written and entertaining. The description of boyhood in a New England family, in the youthful days of the missionary Brainerds, reminds one of some of the pictures in Whittier's Snow Bound. David Brainerd, already well known to fame, is the principal figure in the first hundred pages. The remainder of the volume is chiefly occupied with matter entirely new to the public, from the manuscript journal and letters of his brother and successor in the missionary field.

John Brainerd, although not marked by the force of intellect, or the heroic enterprise of David, was a self-sacrificing and successful missionary, of high Christian attainments, whose labours associated him intimately with the best and greatest in the churches of his connection. The author, in editing the remnant of Mr. Brainerd's journal, with the letters which have been preserved, wisely gives them as they stand. They are worth more for history than anything which now, at the end of three generations, could be written to illustrate the labours of the missionary, his own character, or that of the times.

We hope the book will be estimated by the reading public as it deserves, as a valuable contribution to the history of the church in our land. But, whether it meets with immediate encouragement or not, its importance will remain unchanged. For its subject matter is information, otherwise unpublished, of a kind which the Christian world, once in possession of, will not willingly suffer to perish.

The Old Flag. American Sunday-school Union.

An interesting story, well written, and illustrating the power of religion and patriotism as related to the recent civil war.

Isa Greame's World. American Sunday-school Union.

This volume is beautiful in its mechanical execution, and equally beautiful as a narrative, founded mainly on fact, which, in fascinating style, shows the benign influence of true piety on individual and social life.

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1866.

No. III.

ART. I.—*History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe.* By the Rev. W. E. H. LECKEY, M. A. In two volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

History of Rationalism; embracing a Survey of the Present State of Protestant Theology. By the Rev. JOHN F. HURST, A. M. With Appendix of Literature. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

Essays on the Supernatural in Christianity, with Special Reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tubingen School. By Rev. GEORGE P. FISHER, M. A., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost; or, Reason and Revelation. By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

THE simultaneous appearance of these and other important works, for and against Rationalism, from such various quarters —sceptical, Papal, and orthodox evangelical—only proves how profoundly the mind of all parties in Christendom is agitated on the subject. These several parties, of course, take very different views in regard to it. The sceptics laud Rationalism

as the chief instrument of human progress, enlightenment, and civilization, the great emancipator of the race from superstition, bigotry, persecution—all forms of religious barbarism and reptile delusion. Such is the scope of Mr. Leckey's very able but one-sided work, which, under another title, breathes very much the spirit of Buckle's *History of Civilization*. On the other hand, the evangelical and orthodox deem Rationalism, just in proportion to the degree and continuance of it, destructive of Christianity and all the beneficent fruits which it has showered upon our race, and which go so far to prove the divinity of its origin. Such is the drift of Hurst's *History of Rationalism*, a work of great value, notwithstanding some unworthy thrusts at Calvinism; while Professor Fisher rather fortifies the great defences of supernaturalism, and makes the blows of its assailants to recoil upon themselves. Archbishop Manning, on the other hand, agrees with evangelical Protestants in denouncing Rationalism as the deadly foe of religion. But he differs from them in maintaining that the Romish hierarchy or church is the only barrier and defence against it; and that rationalists are not only they who infringe upon the normal and paramount authority of the word of God, but those who question the infallibility of the Romish church, and of the Pope, its head. It is difficult then to exaggerate the importance of Rationalism, and of correct apprehensions of its real character, tendency, and influence.

What then is Rationalism? One answer to this question is, that it is the illegitimate exaltation of human reason in those matters of religion which are the subject of Divine revelation. This, though intrinsically a true, is nevertheless, for the purposes of this discussion, but a partial and relative definition of it. That which, in the view of some, is an illegitimate, in the view of others, is a legitimate use of reason in the premises. The orthodox and evangelical denounce, as subversive of the due authority of the word of God, what latitudinarians and liberals assert to be only the righteous prerogative of reason, and our only shield against bigotry and superstition. To define Rationalism, then, as the illegitimate elevation of reason in religion determines nothing, except for those who adopt the lawful standard in regard to its use. All parties claim that

they favour the right use of reason in matters of revelation. But they differ as to what constitutes such use of it.

There is, however, one view or definition of Rationalism in which all parties pretty nearly coincide. According to this, Rationalism is that mode or system of thinking in religion which makes human reason the supreme standard or authority therein. It admits of nothing on the authority of revelation which does not receive the sanction or endorsement of human reason, not merely on the ground of being revealed, but as judged by the standards of this faculty, in its natural state. This definition is accepted and given by rationalists themselves. So Wegscheider, in his *Institutiones Dogmaticæ*, as quoted by Hurst, says that Rationalism teaches "that the subject matter of every supposed supernatural revelation is to be examined according to the ideas regarding religion and morality, which we have formed in the mind by the help of reason. . . . Whosoever, therefore, despising that supremacy of human reason, maintains that the authority of a revelation, said to have been communicated to certain men in a supernatural manner, is such that it must be obeyed by all means, without any doubt, that man takes away and overturns from the foundation the true nature and dignity of man," &c., &c. Staudlin, as quoted by the same author, describes Rationalism as the opinion "that reason has the highest authority and right of decision in matters of faith and morality, so that an edifice of faith and morals built on this foundation shall be called Rationalism." Leckey says of Rationalism: "Its central conception is the elevation of conscience into the supreme authority as the religious organ. . . . It revolves around the ideal of Christianity, and represents its spirit without its dogmatic system and its supernatural narratives. From both of these it unhesitatingly recoils, while deriving all its strength and nourishment from Christian ethics." Vol. i., pp. 181—4.

If this is the account given of Rationalism by its friends, others will scarcely question its accuracy, so far as it goes. The ascription of such prerogatives to human reason, in regard to the authority and content of revelation, is surely Rationalism, whatever may be true of less than this. Professor Hahn says: "As to Rationalism, this word was used in the seven-

teenth and eighteenth centuries by those who considered reason as the source and norm of faith." Bretschneider says the rationalists "allow that revelation *may* contain much out of the power of reason to explain, but say that it should assert nothing contrary to reason, but rather what may be proved by it. . . . They only mean the accepting those doctrines which they like, and which seem to them reasonable. . . . In practice they reject the positive doctrines of Christianity, (I mean especially the doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, the Mediation and Intercession of our Lord, Original Sin, and Justification by Faith,) because they allege that these doctrines are contrary to reason."

The sum of all these definitions or representations of Rationalism is that, in some form or degree, it makes reason the supreme authority in religion, and paramount to the word of God, when the two come into conflict. Of this there are various degrees, ranging from the absolute renunciation of the word of God, and even the possibility of a supernatural revelation, to the rationalistic explaining away from one or more Christian doctrines those elements which, however scriptural, are unwelcome to the feelings, or inexplicable to the reason of the unbeliever. But perhaps rationalists may be reduced to three radical classes.

1. Those who deny either that it is possible, or that it is reasonable, for God so far to interfere with and counterwork the uniform laws of nature, as to make a supernatural revelation, or to attest it infallibly by miracles. Of course, such rationalists are simply infidels. They may hold to a something, miscalled inspiration. But it is only the inspiration of genius, of Homer, Plato, Bacon, Kant, and other great masters of our race. It imparts no infallible certainty or authority.

2. The second grade of Rationalism is that which admits a revelation in the Bible authenticated by miracles, but so mixed with human additions, and modified by the moulds of human expression through which it comes to us, that it is left to human reason to determine what portions of it are the word of God, and how far they are so, and how far they are human. This really makes reason the supreme judge and arbiter in religion. For it will only admit that to be from God which

accords with the judgments of reason. In this class fall Socinians and Unitarians, *et id genus omne.*

A third class admit the Scriptures to be the word of God, and the supreme and sufficient rule of faith and practice. But they qualify this recognition with various rationalistic conditions or explanations. Many say that the Bible is inspired as to its thoughts, but not as to its words, which opens the door to endless license in rejecting or explaining away whatever in it is disliked. Many say that nothing can be revealed in it which is above or contrary to the dictates of reason, conscience, or their instinctive feelings. Consequently they explain away whatever seems contrary or inexplicable to their reason, or repugnant to their feelings. This is of every shade, from Socinianism, through Arianism, Sabellianism, Pelagianism, Arminianism, to some forms of metaphysical and rationalizing Calvinism. Some are rationalistic on some points of scriptural doctrine, who are wholly free from such a bias in other matters. Some rationalize the Trinity into Sabellianism or Semi-Arianism, who have no difficulty with the Incarnation, or other high scriptural mysteries. Some twist the Incarnation out of its scriptural proportions, who have no trouble with other points. Others still fall to eviscerating the scriptural and church doctrines of Original Sin, Inability, Regeneration, Atonement, because they cannot construe them in a manner satisfactory to their intellects or sensibilities. Such is Rationalism. It is the exaltation of Reason to supreme authority in matters of Religion, an authority paramount to and overbearing revelation, or forcing the interpretation thereof into conformity to itself, when the two are in collision. This process in regard to any or all the doctrines of revelation, is, as far as it goes, rationalistic. The question arises, how far this is a lawful or normal use of reason in the premises. If it is not, then the first definition of Rationalism, as the illegitimate use of human reason in religion, which we let go for the time, as uncertain, is validated by the second, which is recognized as just by all parties.

What then is the legitimate province of Reason with reference to the contents or averments of the word of God? To

this three generic answers are given, which, of course, are capable of manifold subdivisions.

The first is the rationalistic answer already presented, which gives human reason the prerogative of rejecting whatever declarations of Scripture do not accord with the natural feelings and judgments of the human mind.

The second is the Papal doctrine. According to this not only is Reason not permitted to exalt itself against Scripture, but it is not permitted to ascertain or judge what Scripture teaches. Its only function is to take the interpretations and decisions of the infallible church as to the mind of the Spirit written and unwritten, as these are declared by the Pope or by ecumenical councils. "All appeals to Scripture alone, or to Scripture and antiquity, whether by individuals or by local churches, are no more than appeals from the divine voice of the living church, and therefore essentially rationalistic."*

The third is the orthodox and evangelical view, which maintains the plenary inspiration, infallible truth, and supreme authority of the sacred Scriptures, while it assigns to reason simply the function of ascertaining and bowing to their teachings. This does not exclude efforts to reconcile these teachings with each other, with knowledge from other sources, and with right reason, and to put them into the most rigid scientific system; always however upon this condition, that the indubitable testimony of Scripture is true, however inexplicable, and whatever else may be false.

This we hold to be the true view—the only one which can logically escape Rationalism and infidelity on the one hand, and Romanism on the other; which, indeed, can make the Bible a real rule of faith or guide of life.

Nevertheless this view, although palpably and undeniably true, is not without difficulties in the details of its application. Questions and problems arise at every point which task our insight, patience, and candour for their solution. These will appear as we go on to point out the particular functions of reason in ascertaining the meaning of the Scriptures.

1. It is obvious that human reason, in order to believe the

* *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, by Archbishop Manning, p. 44.

truths of Scripture, must be able to discern their import. It is the eye which sees this light from heaven, these beams of the Sun of Righteousness. Without the bodily eye, the light of a thousand suns leaves us still in darkness. Without the eye of the soul, which is reason, it could not see the meaning of a Divine revelation speaking with all the clearness and self-evidence of axioms. But while there is a certain analogy between the outer and the inner eye, as the organs or receptivities respectively for taking in material and spiritual light, it is but partial. A difference soon appears. The eye of the body may open itself from a state of previous darkness upon all that the sun discloses of the material universe. It brings no contribution of light itself in order that it may be able to see the light of the sun and what it unveils. Not so with the eye of the soul as regards the light of revelation. In order to be capable of perceiving the ideas and truths therein set forth, it must itself be furnished with a certain stock of elementary ideas and truths, as the pre-condition thereof. How could the revelation of God's being, infinitude, truth, holiness, justice, goodness, be communicated to one who had no conception of the meaning of these things? How could the charge to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God, be received by one who had no conception of the meaning of these duties? How could the Scriptures so often reason with men, and summon them also to reason on these great matters, if they were void of all light, all ideas and truths of reason? Reason without any insight into such truths is no reason. It is at best but undeveloped, potential reason; not reason actualized. And it is only reason possessing the first ideas and truths of reason that is capable of being amplified and purified by revelation.

2. If a certain light of reason is requisite to receiving the light of revelation, the question arises, how far any revelation or interpretation of revelation can be received which is in conflict with the clear intuitions or evident deductions of reason: and how far we are authorized by forced interpretations to eliminate from Scripture its obvious meaning, if that meaning be opposed to our most confident judgments or earnest feelings. In answer to this it may be said generally, that revelation, while enlarging the sphere and correcting the errors of the

human understanding, incorporates into itself these first axioms of reason; or, in another view, engrafts its own teachings upon the truths thus already known to, and, indeed, themselves being constituent elements of, human reason. Revelation does not repudiate these, it does but enlarge, clarify, and perfect our understanding of them.

This is only saying that it does not destroy, it rather illuminates and perfects reason.

But, in thus instructing reason, two requisites are needed in reason itself, in order to be capable of such instruction. 1. That, as has been shown, it be capable of apprehending the matter taught, and 2, that it be capable of receiving or submitting to this teaching, in other words, that it be teachable. And in order to be teachable, it must recognize its own inferiority and insufficiency on all matters on which it is to be instructed by revelation. But how can this be, if reason sets itself up as judge of what alone is possible to be true, and therefore alone possible to be revealed even by infallible authority and omniscient wisdom. Plainly, so far as reason is invested with such prerogatives, revelation is irrelevant, solecistical and impossible. But how far is it so? In answer we say,

3. The only limits to the possibility or possible scope of a revelation from heaven, is that it cannot contradict known truths which have an incontestable certainty, whether from revelation itself, or the self-evident intuitions and axioms of reason, or the indubitable testimony of the senses. This is only saying that truth cannot contradict truth: that it is impossible for a thing to be and not to be at the same time; that God cannot teach, and we cannot believe that the same thing is and is not at the same moment. Such is the principle, about which, fairly understood, there can be no difference of opinion. This is the *judicium contradictionis*, which the most orthodox divines have recognized as being the necessary prerogative of reason in determining the possible contents of revelation. And this is the only prerogative which they do concede to it. While there can be no difference of opinion as to this principle in itself considered, there is the widest diversity as regards its application. And this difference runs through the whole range

of opinion from the most reverent faith to the most destructive rationalism. A just application of the principle is safe and salutary. A false application of it is ruinous to the full extent to which it is carried. The false and destructive rationalistic application of this principle lies in finding contradictions where there are only mysteries, and in treating what are merely apparent contradictions as if they were real. This will be seen as we proceed to examine the several classes of cases involved.

But first a word as to the distinction between a contradiction and a mystery, which Rationalism is always endeavouring to confound; *i. e.*, by straining mysteries into contradictions.

Now we have seen what a contradiction is. It is at once affirming and denying the same predicate of the same subject. Its formula is, A is B, A is not B; or more grossly, A is, A is not.

A mystery, on the other hand, is what we can in some sense apprehend, but cannot comprehend. We may know that it is, but not how or why it is. But what is meant by this? Why, simply that we cannot explain its points of contact and modes of agreement with other related truths. Such is the Trinity, the Incarnation, the origin of evil, the omnipresence of God, the principle of life and growth. But this is wholly different from contradiction which asserts directly and immediately that what is, is not. That children cannot see why an iron anchor should sink, and an iron ship should swim, why a feather should rise and stone fall; why one picture seen through glass should display only one surface, while two seen in a stereoscope display depth as well as surface, is no evidence that they are not so. And in the things of God, what are we but children and less than children? Now one great enormity of Rationalism lies in its constant attempt to turn mysteries into contradictions.

4. Let us look at the application of these principles to the seeming or alleged contradictions of the Scriptures themselves. These are such as that God repents and does not repent, that he does not tempt any man, and yet did tempt Abraham, that he is not willing that any should perish, and yet does will that the rejecters of Christ shall go away into everlasting punish-

ment; that there is but one God, and yet there is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, each of whom is God; then in the sphere of soterology, that men are justified by faith alone, and that they are not justified by faith without works; that when they are weak they are strong; sorrowful yet always rejoicing. This catalogue of contradictions in sound but not in sense found in Scripture, might be indefinitely extended, but it is quite unnecessary. These amply suffice to illustrate our meaning.

Now many have made these and like seeming contradictions a ground of impeaching the inspiration and infallible authority of the Scriptures. They have said, writings so full of contradictions if not of other palpable errors, could not be from God. They must be myths or deliberate impostures. But we need not detain our readers to explain how all these several contradictions in sound are not contradictions in sense.

A much larger class make this false application of the principle of contradiction to particular doctrines in detail, without bringing it to bear against the Bible as a whole. Socinians bring these alleged contradictions of Scripture with itself, or with truths otherwise known, to batter down nearly every distinctive doctrine of the Christian system. Thus they say that God cannot be three and one, because it is a contradiction, to which, of course, the familiar answer is that the Godhead is one as to substance, three as to persons—a trinity or tri-*u*nity which involves no contradiction, however inexplicable the mystery. So of the Incarnation. It is said to be a contradiction that the same person should be both God and man; some hence arguing away his humanity, others his divinity, others still maintaining a hybrid theanthropic *tertium quid* neither human nor divine—all alike corrupting the great mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh, which, however inexplicable, is clearly set forth in Scripture, and is no contradiction, viz., that Christ is both God and man, two natures in one person forever.

So of faith and works; not merely Socinians, but, to some extent, Arminians, Romanists, and ritualists generally, say that what James says of the insufficiency of faith without works, and what the Scriptures uniformly teach of the absolute

necessity of good works and holy living to salvation, contradict the doctrine of exclusive justification by faith in the alone merits of Christ. Whereas, the meaning of Scripture nowhere teaches otherwise than that genuine faith in Christ alone justifies; it only teaches that if faith alone justifies, it is not such faith as is alone, or that a faith without works is dead, no real faith. Other doctrines, such as regeneration, atonement, original sin, are subjected to similar attacks, but we reserve the consideration of them, because they are more strenuously assailed from the side of alleged contradiction to the self-evident truths of reason. It is only necessary to say to all who admit the Divine inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, that all the alleged contradictions and discrepancies between different portions of the sacred volume disappear when they are duly understood, and in such wise, as in no manner to impair, but more fully to establish the complete credibility and authority of the whole and the parts. Its averments do not mutually subvert, but elucidate and confirm each other. And hence it follows,

5. That if there be apparent contradictions in Scripture which are not real, and which, however plausibly urged against catholic Christianity, are found to be wholly unsubstantial, then the same is quite as likely to be true of apparent contradictions between Scripture or scriptural doctrines and the most evident testimonies of sense or reason; in short of all our natural faculties intuitive and deductive. What witness against any truths of revelation can be stronger than revelation itself? Yet we have found that such contradictions in word and sound exist in Scripture, which, when properly understood, are no real contradictions. Is not this then much more likely to prove true of any apparent contradiction between the clear, obvious, manifoldly repeated teachings of Scripture on any subject, and some obvious fact or maxim known through our natural intelligence? And if so, ought we not to be slow to conclude that the apparent contradiction is real, believing that in some way and time it must and will be so explained as to disappear; at all events, that there is a solution of the apparent contradiction which, though undiscoverable by us, is clear to the Omniscient mind? A strong example is furnished in the command to

Abraham to slay his son Isaac. Will our moral nature, either in its judgments or feelings, sanction the propriety and rectitude of that command, otherwise than as faith overrules their spontaneous impulses, and asserts that whatever God does is right, whether we can reconcile it with our standards and ideas of right or not? Yet will it do, will any one dare to expunge or contradict this part of the sacred history, because we know not how to explain it into harmony with our moral intuitions? It is true, and it is right, even if we cannot see *how* it is so by our reason, but only *that* it is so by our faith.

It is indeed true that a book which on the whole enjoins immoralities and fosters wickedness cannot be from God who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity; and the obvious scope of the revelations and requirements of the Bible is to promote that holiness which is one evidence of its divine origin. But this is perfectly consistent with the fact that we may not be able at once, or even in this life, to see all the ways of contact and conciliation between all points of that revealed truth which sanctifies, and other truths natural and revealed, moral and physical. The presumption, nay the certainty, that such revealed truth can be reconciled with all other truth, even if we do not know how, is strong enough to forbid its rejection. If we cannot reconcile the conflict with other truths, it may be that others can; it is certain that God can. To admit that men are at liberty to reject what scriptural doctrines they see not how to reconcile with other known truths, under the plea that they involve contradictions, would be most fatal to all faith. It would legitimate the most destructive scepticism and rationalism. This may easily be made apparent.

Thus, if we take the simple elementary doctrines of God's decrees and man's free-agency, they are both true and self-consistent, though multitudes have been unable to construe to themselves the way or even possibility of their agreement. Every man knows that he is free. And yet it is clearly taught that all his actions and all events are foreordained. Some see how such antecedent certainty no way conflicts with the freedom of action. But suppose any cannot see it. Are they therefore at liberty to reject, as so many Arminians, Pelagians, and Socinians have done, the decrees of God in order to spare

man's free-agency, or, with fatalists and hyper-calvinists, to destroy free-agency in order to preserve decrees?

Then comes Original Sin. There is no possible aspect in which this can be viewed in which it does not involve mystery, or something difficult of reconciliation with some known truths; in this respect sharing the difficulties of the origin of evil, at once the most undeniable and inexplicable of all facts. But will it do for men to take the liberty of denying that the race fell in the fall of Adam, and in judgment for his sin while standing on probation for them? If many find it hard to see the equity of this scriptural account of our fallen state, do not manifold greater difficulties burden every other theory? So of native pollution and guilt; they have their difficulties. But are not the pangs and death suffered by our race from the first, unspeakably greater difficulties on the supposition of their freedom from sin? And how are they salvable in Christ, if they are not sinful and lost?

Again, there is the doctrine of Atonement, or of the expiation of sin through the sufferings and death of Christ in the sinner's room and stead. How many insist that this is contradictory to that primitive moral axiom that it cannot be right that the innocent should suffer the punishment of the guilty. Now we know the singular and unapproachable combination of circumstances that take this unique case beyond the reach of this axiom, such as the infinite worth, high prerogative, and sovereign consent of the adorable Sufferer. But suppose we did not see this, or were unable to comprehend its force, are we therefore at liberty to presume there is no solution of the difficulty, even in the Omniscient mind, and to follow the Socinians and Humanitarians in discarding this fundamental doctrine of Christianity, so manifoldly taught in the Bible as the only foundation of the sinner's hope, and of the religion of the Bible itself? Or are we at liberty, like some who stop short of this extreme, and retain the idea of some indirect and constructive substitution of Christ suffering for the merited punishment of the redeemed sinner, to say that these sufferings were not penal in lieu of our punishment, when the Scripture so manifoldly represents him as bearing our sins, the chastisement of our peace, and becoming sin, a curse, and a sacrifice for us?

Especially, if a closer and deeper examination will prove that the obvious meaning of Scripture is in truer accord with the profoundest intuitions and feelings of the human soul, when oppressed with a sense of sin, than any scheme of atonement which requires a more forced and non-natural exposition of the Scriptures?

Now let us pass to another great doctrine—Inability—viz., the doctrine so explicitly and variously taught in Scripture, asserted in the creeds and devotional literature of Christendom, affirmed by all Christians on their knees before God, that without Divine grace we are unable to keep the law, obey the gospel, and lead holy lives. It is said that this contradicts the intuitive maxim, that obligation cannot exceed our power; or that we cannot be obliged or rightly required to do or be what we have no power to do or be. Because of this apparent inconsistency, are we therefore at liberty to presume there can be no reconciliation between the two, or that we so fully apprehend the true and full meaning of these supposed contradictories, as to know that they must be really such, past all possibility of being harmonized, and that hence we must follow the Arminians, Pelagians, and so many in this country who disown these titles, in denying a real inability, and asserting some form of plenary ability? By no manner of means. Scripture and Christian experience in its favour are quite enough to prove that it must harmonize with all other truths, whether we can see how or not.

But a little closer examination will show us that a true understanding of the maxim that obligation is commensurate with ability, does not conflict with the scriptural doctrine of inability. For this inability is our sin; the strength and dominion of sinful lusts and passions. But surely sin cannot be excusable in proportion to its strength and mastery. Nor is it any part of the import of the axiom in question that we are under no obligation to put away sin, because it has dominion over us. The maxim in question only excuses from outward acts which we are physically powerless to perform, and from those inward acts and states for which we are disabled by other causes than our sin. The alleged contradiction, therefore, is wholly imaginary.

The same is true of a like plea for rejecting inability, on the ground of its apparent conflict with the popular axiom, that nothing is moral which is not voluntary, a maxim claimed to be at variance not only with inability, but with original sin, and divine regeneration. Hence large classes have in various degrees repudiated or pared down these doctrines. But this maxim properly understood, in its sense as well as its sound, does not contradict any or all of these great doctrines. When it is used by the people it is meant either with reference to outward acts, in which sense it is strictly true in the narrowest sense of the word *will*, as the mere power of volition; or the word *will* and its adjective voluntary are taken in the broad sense in which it was formerly used, for all the non-cognitive powers of the mind, together with the exercises and states thereof—*i. e.*, as embracing desires, feelings, and dispositions with regard to moral objects. In this sense also it is strictly true. In one or the other of the above senses is the maxim used when asserted as an axiom; and in neither of them does it conflict with the great doctrines which it is claimed to contradict.

Now suppose we admit the principle that we are at liberty to reject every doctrine fully set forth in Scripture because of some show of antagonism between it and what we count as self-evident principles, how readily will every cardinal doctrine of Christianity be swept away, not because of any real contradiction, but because of a seeming conflict arising from crude and undefined conceptions of them or either of them? The examples already adduced show how few landmarks of the Christian faith could stand before such hermeneutics.

One source of difficulty in this matter is the great doubt or uncertainty as to what are and what are not self-evident principles, and, when this is determined, what is a proper statement or exact expression of them. Plain as it might seem that self-evident principles are self-evidencing, and therefore past all dispute, it is no less certain that they have been the subjects of constant controversy among metaphysicians. Locke's assault on innate ideas was but an attempt to disprove the existence of supersensual intuitive truths, such as the first axioms in morals and metaphysics. Dr. Thomas Brown cau-

tions us against a tendency to the undue multiplication of first truths, beyond the very fewest which alone are such, observing that disputants are tempted to this, both from their indolence which inclines to the easy resort of self-affirmation when the labour of proof is needed, and from that partizan zeal which is inclined to exalt the dogmas of their own clique or clan to the dignity and authority of axioms and first truths: a propensity noticed by an old father, who tells us, *Unaquæque gens illud legem naturæ putat quod didicit.*

Hence the most eminent metaphysicians have come to devote great attention to elaborating the tests and criteria of intuitive truths. Hamilton gave some of his best efforts to this work. McCosh has recently published a volume on the "Intuitions of the Human Mind," of which valuable discussion on this subject constitutes a leading part. We cannot here go into this subject at any length. We will only state three criteria of intuitive truths which they have reached, viz., self-evidence, necessity, and catholicity, or universal acceptance; to which Hamilton adds simplicity or incomprehensibility, *i. e.*, the impossibility of being resolved into, or comprehended under aught that is more simple or ultimate. To develope this matter at large would require an independent article, indeed, many of them. Men are very apt to think that self-evident which is only very evident and dear to themselves. It is so evident to Unitarians and other latitudinarians, that they think and pronounce it self-evident, that for God to inflict on his sinless Son the sufferings due to penitent sinners, is the climax of absurdity. But quite the contrary is evident to the Christian world, who joyfully accept this glorious truth, in the belief of which

"The saints of all ages in harmony meet."

But not only does it require careful inquiry to determine what are these first truths and axioms, but also to fix the proper statement of them. It is generally, and justly, accepted as a first or self-evident truth that every event must have a cause. But a common and inadvertent mode of stating this truth was, that every *thing* (or being) must have a cause—a very different proposition, and leading to far different consequences. If every thing or being must have a cause, then God

must have a cause, or be created, which is Atheism. Like examples of the misapprehension, or misstatement, or misapplication of intuitive principles we have already seen, in reference to the equation of ability and responsibility, the punishment of the innocent instead of the guilty, the impossibility of three being one, etc.

While therefore the *judicium contradictionis* is a sound principle rightly applied, yet the perversion or misapplication of it runs into the most destructive Rationalism—1. even with respect to seeming contradictions between different portions of the language of Scripture; and 2. between these and the self-evident truths of reason which shine in their own light. And if this be so in these cases, much more must it be so in reference to any supposed contradiction between the obvious and didactic meaning of Scripture, and the conclusions reached by a course of reasoning physical or metaphysical, in which we are notoriously liable to err. It is far safer to presume there is some undetected flaw in our reasoning, than in the obvious meaning of the word of God, as shown in its literal and figurative statements, its implications, and the whole analogy of faith. Rationalism appears when mysteries are rejected either simply because they are mysteries, or because they are treated as contradictions when they are only inexplicable.

If all this be true of the points of contact between the obvious and repeated testimonies of Scripture, and whatever may seem in conflict with them, whether on its own pages, in the self-evident intuitions or the logical deductions of reason, in short, in the entire realms of theology, metaphysics, and psychology, what are we to say of similar apparent contradictions between the obvious meaning of scriptures and facts known, or conceived to be known, in regard to the material world, immediately by the senses, or mediately through the investigations, experiments, the inductive generalizations, and deductive reasonings of physical science?

The relations of physical science and religion are not without their share of perplexity. Many crude generalities have currency, which, if true in some sense, are not true in every sense, and for all purposes for which they are employed. It is truly said that the Bible does not aim or claim to teach physical

science. It is equally true that it teaches the facts out of which the science of theology is constructed, but does not in the strictest sense give the science, or scientific form of those facts. That is, it does not give the science in addition to the facts of theology. And it is further true that it does not teach falsehoods, whether in physics or metaphysics, whether in a scientific or unscientific form. Any facts taught by the infallible authority of God are facts, whether physical or psychological, whether they relate to stopping the sun in its course, walking on the sea, rending the rocks, raising the dead, or regenerating the soul. And these facts should be allowed and estimated at their real value by all truly scientific minds, as well as other facts discerned by our natural faculties.

It is often urged that the sacred writers speak of the sun's rising, as if herein they taught what science has disproved. But what is taught by this language? Just what is taught now by it, that the position of the sun relatively to the earth becomes elevated, but not which of the two bodies actually moves away from the other. No language is used in regard to the sun's rising in Scripture which is not just as freely used now, in full view of the sun being fixed, and the earth being in motion. In short, no language is used which is not, in its real significance, congruous with the ascertained facts of science. When we say that the shore recedes as the vessel we are in moves away from it, every one understands this merely as asserting that the distance between us and the shore increases, but not that the shore literally moves. The same principle applies to the sun's rising.

Now let us consider how some other alleged indisputable facts in the physical sphere are cited as contradictions of scriptural declarations or cardinal Christian doctrines. It has been said that the resurrection of the body which dies is impossible, because some of the materials of which it is composed go to form different human bodies as they are at death. Battle-fields are fertilized with human bodies, which thus form plants to become the food of other bodies. How then can the same bodies be raised again? This would be in point, if the identity of our own bodies now consisted in absolute continued sameness of all their particles. But it does not. They are

undergoing constant change of these, and change them entirely in seven years, without losing their identity.

Some scientists claim that the evidence of our race being composed of distinct species, is too strong to consist with the truth of the scriptural account of the descent of mankind from a single pair,—a fact which runs through the whole scriptural system of anthropology and soterology. Are we, therefore, to surrender the great doctrines of the unity of our race, its fall in the fall of the first Adam, and redemption by the second Adam? Is it possible that Agassiz, or any one else, can find any proofs about the origin of species subversive of this great truth? In point of fact, the most rigorous analysis of the criteria of species goes to indicate that our race constitute one species. But suppose it were otherwise,—that many things are as we should expect them to be, if mankind were several species. What then? Can they be decisive enough to overthrow the word of God? or to require its plain averments and implications to be frittered away?

We may pass all reference to the cosmogony of Genesis, and the discoveries of geology. It is enough that, conceding the utmost in regard to its facts, the Bible gives but a single detailed narrative on the genesis of the worlds, and that at most it only requires that day and night should have a breadth of signification which they often bear in Scripture and common speech, to effect a perfect conciliation between science and Scripture on this subject. But seriously, will it be pretended that evidence decisive enough has been obtained against any clear, repeated, manifoldly stated, and implied testimonies of Scripture, to require wrenching and violence of interpretation?

The whole department of miracles is within the domain of physics. That is to say, it has to do with the production of phenomena cognizable by the senses, and dependent on such cognition for their efficacy; and they are not in apparent harmony with the laws of nature, discovered by physical science. They involve the direct suspension, or interruption, or counteraction of those laws—*i. e.*, by whatever name we may choose to call it, such an intervention of special supernatural power as prevents their ordinary normal effects. Now it is the fashion of sceptical scientists, and scientific sceptics, to

assume the impossibility of any interruption of the laws of nature or of their uniform working. Many of them assume the a-priori impossibility of such supernatural interposition. Others assume that the uniformity of the laws of nature, past all possibility of interruption, in itself or its manifestations, by any special divine interposition, has been proved by the simple fact that we now find them to be invariable. This is one cardinal principle of Positivism, and of all who imbibe its spirit. It of course rules out all miracle, revelation, supernatural grace, to say nothing of special providence. It is therefore the doctrine of Atheists. But it is the doctrine of many who would resent the charge of Atheism, nay, of many who claim to be Christians. Whole treatises, most extended and elaborate, are now given to the public by such writers as Baden Powell, Leckey, and Draper; the key-note of which is, that society advances in proportion as it gets rid of belief in the supernatural. Says Draper, "is not momentary intervention altogether derogatory to the thorough and absolute sovereignty of God." "The process of attaining correct views of nature has been marked by a continual decline of the mysterious and supernatural." This is the whole drift of Leckey's book on Rationalism. These writers lump together the Christian miracles, supernatural grace, demonology, witchcraft, the lying wonders of impostors, praying for propitious weather and for health, in one category of preposterous delusion, which the growing knowledge of the invariability of nature's laws will dissipate.

Now here these sceptical scientists claim to have discovered a fact or law which is utterly contradictory to Christianity and all supernatural religion. What then? And are we to concede it? By no manner of means. The answer to it all is the existence of a Personal God, who can make and unmake; who can do his whole pleasure in establishing, continuing, or arresting any mode or law of nature's working, if adequate reasons therefor exist. To authenticate his own revelation, and redeem sinners, is a sufficient reason for such special interposition. It is only the lowest deep of stolid scepticism that is unable to see the resplendent proofs of a Personal God; of his power to interpose for the control and disposal of his own universe at his pleasure; of the fitness of such intervention for the salvation

of the lost; of his actual interposition as evinced in the self-evident divinity of his own word, and the incarnation and sacrifice of his own Son therein recorded. We confess that there is no class of writers and thinkers of whom we can think with less respect or even patience. We have just about as much respect for their claims to superior insight, because they are blind to the evidence and even possibility of a personal reigning God, of miracles, revelation, and redemption, as we should have for the pretence of a bat to see better than other animals because it cannot see daylight. The slave in the hut, with one glimpse of Christ, knows more and better than all this shallow and one-sided dogmatism. The least of Christ's little ones has an unspeakably greater breadth and depth of insight than is dreamt of in such philosophy.

What conclusions then do we reach respecting the oppositions of science, whether truly or falsely so called, to religion? That science is to be fettered in its search after truth, or that its indubitably established facts are not to be recognized by Christian believers, or that the word of Divine truth can contradict any truth certainly ascertained by sense, reason, science or philosophy? Not at all. Let science be untrammelled in its investigations, and go wherever evidence leads it. But then let it be candid enough to look at all the evidence, from every source, and weigh it impartially. Let it not shut out valid testimony by a-priori assertions of its incredibility. Let it take the evidence of testimony, as well as the senses. Suppose that some geologic inductions require that the Danube or the Nile, at their mouths, should have trended in one direction three thousand years ago, and reliable historical testimony and monuments prove that they trended in another; is this latter source of knowledge to be ignored or contemned? Suppose that any physicist judges from an examination of the fauna and flora of different zones, that our race sprung from different pairs and is made up of different species, is the evidence of its original unity derived from ethnology, comparative philology, and scriptural history, to be discarded? They are to be free to learn all about the sciences which their senses, aided by observation, experiment, and inductive reasoning, can tell them. They are bound equally to see that the Bible is the word of God, to

believe its testimonies, to weigh well their bearing on these subjects, and give them their due significance. And if two interpretations of some ascertained phenomena are possible, one consistent, the other inconsistent with the obvious meaning of the sacred word, they are bound a thousand times over to give the preference to the former. And they are bound to wait long and ponder well, and be sure of their facts, before they come to the conclusion to wrest Scripture from its natural meaning to a forced construction in accommodation to their views, lest they wrest it to their own destruction. Numerous scientists now tell us there is evidence not merely of the invariability of nature's laws, of the correlation of forces, and the conversion of matter from one form into another, but that matter is alike incapable of destruction or creation, and that all interruption of natural laws, all miracles and supernatural agencies, are impossible. Now this is in blank contradiction to the Scriptures, and even to the possibility of revelation. Are these scientists at liberty to fix their opinions on such subjects, ignoring the evidences of the divinity and infallibility of the Scriptures, and the proof these afford of the creation and destructibility of matter, and of supernatural intervention in the work of grace and salvation? Is not this like shutting our eyes to the sun, in order to clarify our vision and brighten our light? Like boasting of deeper and broader insight because we look at subjects with one eye, and that in the back of the head?

And now what constitutes a truly reliable and judicial habit of mind on these issues between, we do not say science, but some scientists, and the teachings of Scripture, the tenets of the Christian faith? Is it a state which ignores, or is blind, or indifferent to revelation, its evidences, averments, and cardinal truths? This cannot be. We might as well say it is requisite to a judicial condition of mind in metaphysics to ignore the primary intuitions of sense or reason, or in a disputed question of law to set aside or be indifferent to the first principles of jurisprudence. Such an attempt is absurd, irrational, impracticable. It is like putting out our eyes in order to see, discarding the first elements of reason in order to be rational, the most reliable sources of proof in order to an impartial judgment.

Neither are we to ignore any facts clearly proved by the testimony of our senses, of other reliable witnesses, of authentic history, or of clear deduction therefrom. These we are to weigh well in connection with all the assertions of Scripture. But we are not to conclude, in case of any apparent disagreement, that the inspired witnesses are of course mistaken, or probably so. We are to revise our evidence from natural sources, and see that there is no mistake, or reasonable possibility of mistake, either in the testimony so given, or our estimates of, and deductions from it. If finally it appears that somewhat is incontrovertibly established contrary to a more obvious and accepted interpretation of any portion of Scripture, then let this interpretation be revised, with all other evidence on the subject, and an adjustment or reconciliation sought consistent with all the evidence; but let it be propounded as only problematic and tentative, until due evidence fully confirms it. There is a true and a false prejudice on these and other subjects. We cannot, being Christians, scientists, or even rational beings, come to the fair investigation and adjudication of any subjects without such prejudgments, or prejudices, as are involved in our most intimate and well-founded beliefs or convictions as Christians, scientists, or rational beings. These may be of greater or less strength, according to the evidence on which they are founded; and may yield with greater or less difficulty according to the respective amounts of previous evidence for, and subsequent evidence against them. Such prejudice is involved in true candour and fairness. That prejudice which is without evidence, or against evidence, or which weds the soul to any consistency inconsistent with supreme fealty to truth, is alone to be condemned and abjured.

It is often said that we must meet sceptics, or sceptical scientists, on their own ground. If there is a sense in which this is true, there is certainly a sense in which it is false. If Christians are required to meet sceptics on their own ground, much more are the latter bound to meet Christians on their own ground. Whether and how far we ought to meet sceptics of any class on their own ground, depends entirely on how far that ground is tenable and gives either party a safe foothold

or resting-place. We are to meet them on ground of truth, not of falsehood: we are to abide by this truth and call on them to abide by it, by whatever evidence supported, whether natural or revealed. And whichever party refuses this issue does so at its peril. We will not meet sceptics or others on their own ground, in any sense which requires us to leave the rock and fortress of truth, and go down to be swamped in the ditches and quicksands of falsehood and delusion. When it is demanded of us that we meet any parties on such ground, we most respectfully but decidedly decline, and beg to be excused. If all that is meant by such language is that false science and philosophy ought to be met by true science and philosophy, we grant it. This is consistent with all that we have been maintaining; indeed is what we have been maintaining. But we mean by this simply that so far as scepticism brings false, or misapplies true, philosophy to assail Christian truth, we are called on, as far as practicable, to show the falsity or misapplication of the principle in question, from the scientific or rational stand-point. If the development theory, or the doctrine of the impossibility of supernatural intervention be urged on scientific grounds, let us endeavour to show them false on scientific grounds. But suppose that we fail to convince our sceptical adversary, either because he is too uncandid and bigoted to appreciate the evidence, or refuses to place himself upon any reasonable ground which will afford a premise in argument; or even because as yet it is out of our power to master the reasonings and allegations urged on the scientific side so as to be able to silence our adversaries; are we to confine ourselves to this ground which the sceptic has chosen for himself? are we to surrender to him on his own ground, instead of retaining our high vantage ground of faith in God and his word and its infallible testimonies, knowing that it must be true, and whatever is opposed to it must be false? If clearly shown false now by the light of heaven, we can well afford to wait until it is shown to be such by other light. This light of heaven the sceptic is bound to see and follow. If he refuses to come upon ground where he can see and follow it, if he hates the light, and refuses to come to the light, so much the worse for him. This is his condemnation, that light has come

into the world, and he has loved darkness rather than light. In this aspect we cannot consent to meet upon their own ground those who so darken their souls that for them the light shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not. Let God be true, but every man a liar.

Let us now briefly consider the function of reason in constructing the science of theology, or in harmonizing the truths of revelation with one another, and with related truths—in other words, the relation of philosophy to theology.

While many crude and inconsiderate views are constantly put forth on this subject, often with an air of incontestable authority, we think the main principles regarding it need only to be stated, to command the assent of Christian believers.

In regard to the matter of theology, so far as derived from revelation, the principle or ground of our acceptance of it must be the word of God, and not reason. We receive it because God affirms it; not because, aside of this testimony, it is evident either to sense or reason, or any mere faculty of natural intelligence. "Faith is the evidence (ελεγχος, persuasion) of things not seen." "We walk by faith and not by sight." In regard to the great facts of Christian theology, then, they are made known and proved to us by the word of God, not by any mere unaided natural faculty. Certainly this must be true of the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, of Original Sin, Divine Regeneration, Predestination, the Election and Conservation of the Saints, the Church and Sacraments, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell. The truth in regard to these great themes comes from the word of God, and no way from human reason, which can discover no more than our experienced need of them. So all true believers receive it, "not as the word of man, but (as it is in truth) the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." 1 Thess. ii. 13. It may indeed happen that the human faculties, rightly used, can see things to be true which are asserted in the Scriptures. It may see the fallen and degraded state of our race, the unity of God, the fitness of retribution. But even these are none the less attested to us by revelation, although not entirely hidden from natural reason. In reality, however, the human intellect, in matters of religion, is so dimmed by sin that, aside of the light

of Scripture, and often even in defiance of that light, these truths are very feebly and inadequately seen. The heathen everywhere turn the plainest truths of God into a lie, and change the glory of the incorruptible God into an image of corruptible man. Even so essential a truth as immortality loses its evidence to the sin-darkened reason, until Jesus Christ brings life and immortality to light. When revelation reaffirms and restores these truths, which, though the natural inheritance of reason, have been squandered and lost through sin, reason is very apt to ignore its obligations to revelation for them, and to boast of its own sufficiency in regard to them. We can only see the extent of our obligations to revelation when we see that great mass of moral and religious truths which are the common property of christendom, and lost to heathendom. In the truest sense, therefore, for fallen man, revelation, not reason, is the source and norm of all these, as well as of the more distinctive Christian mysteries. The primary knowledge of these truths is not due to reason, science, or philosophy, but to revelation. Yet they are given us in Scripture, not in any scientific or systematized form, but only as individual facts. The sanctified human mind, however, by the necessity of its nature, and for most important purposes, is constrained to attempt the scientific arrangement and comprehension of these facts. In other words, it strives, from its very constitution, to discover the harmony of these with each other, and with other known truths. It seeks to reach apprehensions, statements, definitions of these and correlate truths, whereby such harmony will be attained, and all appearances of discrepancy or contradiction removed. Hence result formal statements, definitions, systems of theology, didactic and polemic. To this the human mind, regenerate and unregenerate, tends by its own inherent impulses. This is the strongest evidence that it has a mission from God to undertake this work. It has also an express commission from revelation itself to "compare spiritual things with spiritual," and to prophecy according to the proportion of faith. But comparison is the fundamental element in the process of reasoning and systematizing; and to go according to the proportion or analogy of faith, is to interpret Scripture by Scripture, truth by truth, one part in harmony with another,

and each with all. This process is indispensable, not only to answer the innate craving for logical consistency in the human intellect, but also to the exposition, maintenance, and defence of Christian truth, whether in teaching it to friends or parrying the assaults of adversaries. It is needless to show how a series of truths, concatenated not merely in an orderly arrangement, but in their relations of mutual interdependence, consistency, and unity, can be better taught, and more readily defended, than if left a mass of apparent unresolved antagonisms or contradictions, or of disjointed isolated facts, without any perceived principle of unity.

Not only so—not only does the Christian intellect strive so to discern and set forth the harmony of Christianity with itself and correlate truth, as to furnish no weapon which its adversaries may turn against it. The mind of the church further essays to wrest from its enemies the weapons of their own forging. It seeks to show that the objections urged are invalid—and this even on rational or philosophic grounds. It does not, indeed, found faith on anything short of the testimony of God, nor on its success in refuting the objections of adversaries from the rational or philosophic side. But it strives to show that, simply as rational arguments, they are either false, irrelevant, or inconclusive. To this extent, and in ways which have been already illustrated, the theologian and the Christian apologist meet adversaries on their own ground. And still further, in regard to truths which are alike affirmed by revelation and by reason, it endeavours to convince those who will not hear the former, by rational proofs. Thus to those who deny the sin and ruin of the race asserted in the Scriptures, it will endeavour to prove them by incontestable facts.

Hence in all ages, among all parties in the church, except mystics and heretics, there has been a constant effort to formulate and systematize the doctrines of the Bible in creeds and confessions.

And this is not only a necessary measure of defence against heresy, but also against mysticism, which heretics are so fond of making their shield. Mysticism is a distempered form of religion. It may be the result of good or evil tendencies,

according as it supervenes on what was previously below or above it. If it supervene upon dead formalism, supplanting it by a living, though somewhat distempered piety, it of course represents a salutary, because an upward tendency. If it come in the place of intelligent piety moulded by the doctrines of the Bible, with pretensions to supplant and improve upon that style of religion, it is, of course, morbid and pernicious. It is often made pretext for disparaging orthodoxy and intelligent evangelical piety. By mysticism is meant that idea of Christianity which founds it on feeling, or represents it as a life and not a doctrine, nor formed and bounded by a doctrine. Now it is true that Christian piety is a life, a life which includes feeling, but this life is inspired and guided by the truth as it is in Jesus, the doctrine which is according to godliness; this feeling is such as arises from the knowledge and belief of the everlasting gospel. Otherwise, whatever else it may be, it is not Christian piety. Mere feeling uninformed by Christian truth is not Christian feeling, and in proportion as it lacks the guidance and inspiration of such truth, it degenerates into fanaticism, superstition, or mere fleshly excitement, which soon sinks into absolute stupefaction and irreligion. Mysticism divorces religion from the intellect. But no religion can be genuine or scriptural which thus separates itself from knowledge. Christianity interpenetrates and exalts every part of our nature, especially the intellect or regal faculty, that which was designed to regulate feeling, which, if not thus regulated, must needs degenerate into mere irrational sensibility, irreligious, fanatical, or superstitious. This is eternal life to *know* God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. Knowledge and piety can no more be separated than solidity and extension, life and breath.

But no reason is competent for this task which is not a Christian or regenerate reason—a reason purged of the blindness and darkness of sin, which, yielding to the supreme authority of the word of God, surrenders all preconceived opinions and predilections in conflict with it. This is the primary doctrine assumed by reason in all its legitimate efforts to systematize Christian doctrine, construct a science of Christian theology, and reconcile it with all related truths. No

philosophy can be an impartial judge between the great truths of Christianity and the "oppositions of science," which is uncertain or wavering, or indifferent in regard to those truths. We might as well prepare to judge impartially between the claims of the sun and of the earth to be the centre of the planetary system, by shutting out the light of the sun, as to qualify ourselves for an impartial judgment between the Scripture and oppositions to it, by closing our eyes to the light of the word. That mind, whether philosophic or theologic, alone is in a state of judicial candour regarding these questions, which has the candour to see and feel, at the very outset, that God is true though every man be a liar—that his word is the sure and supreme oracle.

> "This is the judge that ends the strife
> When wit and reason fail."

No mind can be in an impartial or judicial state in regard to truths of revelation and antagonistic errors, so long as it rejects or ignores Scripture, and God speaking therein as the supreme judge or arbiter of the controversy. This is the doctrine of Protestant orthodoxy as set forth by its divines and symbols. Says our own Confession of Faith:

"The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself. And therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

"The Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture." (Chap. I. 9–10.)

This brings us to the Papal Doctrine on this subject, to which we have already referred, that the infallible and only authorized interpreter of Scripture is the church, speaking through the pope, or ecumenical councils, or the perpetual and universal faith of all her members; that our simple duty is to accept the interpretations of Scripture and decisions of Christian doctrine given forth through these organs; and that all

private judgment as to its meaning is Rationalism. Such we have already seen to be the doctrine propounded by Archbishop Manning. We can go with him in the following statement, which we think contains all the truth reached in his argument: "Though there is no revealed pledge of infallibility to the saints as such, yet the consent of the saints is a high test of what is the mind and illumination of the Spirit of Truth." P. 97. Less than this we cannot concede to the doctrines accepted *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*, without coming near to a confession that revelation is a failure. While this is so, and genuine catholic doctrine carries a strong presumption of truth, which should have great weight in our interpretations of Scripture, still, the proper objective ground of faith is the testimony of God uttered in and through the Scriptures, and apprehended by the believer. Of course, this involves a judgment on his part as to what the Scripture thus utters and propounds to his faith. But, says the Romanist, this is incompetent and forbidden to him. He cannot and ought not to interpret Scripture for himself. He should take the interpretation and judgments of the infallible church—the decrees of popes and councils, without question or criticism. This is the only alternative to the supremacy of reason, *i. e.*, to Rationalism in matters of religion. Says Manning:

"There can be ultimately no intermediate between the Divine mind declaring itself through an organ of its own creation, or the human mind judging for itself upon the evidence and contents of revelation. There is or there is not a Divine perpetual Teacher in the midst of us. The human reason must be either the disciple or the critic of revelation." P. 85.

"The reason or private judgment of individuals exercised critically upon history, philosophy, theology, Scripture, and revelation, inasmuch as it is the most human, is also the most fallible and uncertain of all principles of faith, and cannot in truth be rightly described to be such. Yet this is ultimately all that remains to those who reject the infallibility of the living church." To all this the obvious answer is:

1. It disguises and misstates the real issue. It confounds judging what the Scriptures mean in view of a fair estimate of the force of language, laws of construction, and the circum-

stances in which they were written, and receiving that meaning, so obtained, as the truth of God, with sitting in judgment on the contents of revelation thus duly ascertained, in order to receive or reject them as they do or do not conform to human reason. The former is legitimate and necessary, and consistent with the absolute subjection of reason to Scripture, with taking the yoke and learning of Christ. The latter exalts reason above the authority of the word of God, and is Rationalism. To say, as Archbishop Manning does, that "reason must be either the disciple or critic of revelation," is to "palter in a double sense" of the word critic. One may be a critic of revelation so far as is necessary to ascertain its meaning, in order that he may be its disciple. This, so far from being inconsistent with discipleship, it is necessary to it. This is not being a critic in such a sense as to subordinate revelation in any manner to the behests of his own reason.

2. The Romish doctrine is plainly at direct variance with the Scriptures, which require us to search the Scriptures because they testify of Christ, and commend the Bereans for so doing, and for testing the preachers they heard thereby. So Timothy is commended for having known from childhood the Holy Scriptures, which are declared "able to make wise to salvation," and all of them to be "given by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii. 15—17. The summons is, "to the law and the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."

3. We do not escape the necessity of judging, even if we are to take the interpretation of Scripture blindly from an infallible pope or church. It is just as necessary for the disciple to interpret and judge of the meaning of the utterances of pontiffs and councils as of the Scriptures themselves. The necessity of judgment on the part of the Christian is not superseded by the voice of the living teacher or infallible interpreter. Such a teacher can only say, "I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say." "He that is spiritual judgeth all things."

4. How shall men know the infallible church and pontiff,

and distinguish them from impostors claiming their prerogatives? Where can they find the marks or criteria of these infallible organs of the Divine mind and will? Is it said we find these marks in the Scriptures? Saying nothing of the old vicious circle of proving the church by the Scriptures, and the Scriptures by the church, it is enough that the Scriptures require us to try by scriptural standards the pretensions of all claiming to be heard as Christian teachers or oracles. We are charged to beware of false prophets, who come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves, and to know them by their fruits. We are commanded to believe not every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they be of God. Those are commended who try them that say they are apostles and are not, and find them liars. Nay, we are charged to give no heed to wonder-workers who successfully simulate real miracles, if they attempt to use these lying wonders to seduce us from the religion of God and his word. Deut. xiii. 1—5. So far then from testing the Scriptures by infallible living teachers, we must test the claims of all teachers by the infallible Scriptures.

Finally, believers as such, and not any infallible pope or council for them, have the promise of Divine guidance in the saving apprehension of the truths essential to salvation. "If any man will do his will," says Christ, "he shall know of the doctrine whether it be from God, or whether I speak of myself." John vii. 17. "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." Dr. Manning and other papal writers seek to evade the force of these and similar passages, by pressing into bold relief the great differences and controversies among those who call themselves Christians. How can these passages refer to private Christians, and how can they be divinely guided, if they are perpetually disputing and contradicting each other? To which the simple answer is; 1. These promises are made to real, not merely nominal or professing Christians. 2. They refer to "all things essential to salvation," not all matters of dispute in religion. 3. The controversies among real Christians are often more verbal than real, or relate to things which, if important,

are non-essential, to the outposts rather than the citadel of the Christian faith; to the speculative rather than the experimental side of Christianity. 4. The Papists are exposed to objections similar in kind, if not in degree. They do not pretend that the pope or the church is infallible in all things, or in things unimportant to salvation. They cannot deny that controversies have prevailed amongst their own divines and schools; they admit that it is only by degrees, and through the developments of successive controversies, that the pope and councils have been enabled accurately to articulate and formulate one doctrine after another. Their argument, therefore, from the controversies among Protestants, for the necessity of an infallible and oracular interpreter of Scriptures, proves too much. It recoils upon themselves with suicidal force. It brings us back to scripture for the interpretation of scripture, which we reach by comparing (συγκρινοντες) spiritual things with spiritual.

"God is his own interpreter,
And he will make it plain."

ART. II.—*Normal Schools, and other Institutions and Agencies for the Professional Education of Teachers.* By HENRY BARNARD, D. D. 2 vols., 8vo. Case, Tiffany & Co., Hartford.

THE term Normal School is an unfortunate misnomer, and its general adoption has led to much confusion of ideas. The word "Normal," from the Latin *norma*, a rule or pattern to work by, does not differ essentially from "Model." A Normal School, according to the meaning of the word, would be a pattern school, an institution which could be held up for imitation, to be copied by other schools of the same grade. But this meaning of the word is not what we mean by the thing. When we mean a school to be copied or imitated, we call it a Model School. Here the name and the thing agree. The name explains the thing. It is very different when we speak

of a Normal School. To the uninitiated, the term either conveys no meaning at all; or, if your hearer is a man of letters, it conveys to him an idea which you have at once to explain away. You have to tell him, in effect, that a Normal School is not a Normal School, and then that it is something else, which the word does not in the least describe.

What then do we mean by a Normal School? What is the thing which we have called by this unfortunate name?

A Normal School is a seminary for the professional education of teachers. It is an institution in which those who wish to become teachers learn how to do their work; in which they learn, not reading, but how to teach reading; not penmanship, but how to teach penmanship; not grammar, but how to teach grammar; not geography, but how to teach geography; not arithmetic, but how to teach arithmetic. The idea which lies at the basis of such an institute, is that knowing a thing, and knowing how to teach that thing to others, are distinguishable and very different facts. The knowledge of the subjects to be taught, may be gained at any school. In order to give to the Teachers' Seminary its full power and efficiency, it were greatly to be desired that the subjects themselves, as mere matters of knowledge, should be first learned elsewhere, before entering the Teachers' School. This latter would then have to do only with its own special function, that of showing its matriculants how to use these materials in the process of teaching. Unfortunately, we have not yet made such progress in popular education as to be able to separate these two functions to the extent that is desirable. Many of those who attend a Teachers' Seminary, come to it lamentably ignorant of the common branches of knowledge. They have consequently first to study these branches in the Normal School, as they would study them in any other school. That is, they have first to learn the facts as matters of knowledge, and then to study the art and science of teaching these facts to others. Instead of coming with their brick and mortar ready prepared, that they may be instructed in the use of the trowel and the plumb-line, they have to make their brick and mix their mortar after they enter the institution. This is undoubtedly a drawback and a misfortune. But it cannot be helped at present. All we can do

is to define clearly the true idea of the Teachers' School, and then to work towards it as fast and as far as we can.

A Normal School is essentially unlike any other school. It has been compared indeed to those professional schools which are for the study of law, divinity, medicine, mining, engineering, and so forth. The Normal School, it is true, is like these schools in one respect. It is established with reference to the wants of a particular profession. It is a professional school. But those schools have for their main object the communication of some particular branch of science. They teach law, divinity, medicine, mining, or engineering. They aim to make lawyers, divines, physicians, miners, engineers, not teachers of these branches. The Professor in the Law School aims, not to make Professors of law, but lawyers. The medical Professor aims, not to make medical lecturers, but practitioners. To render these institutions analogous to the Teachers' Seminary, their pupils should first study law, medicine, engineering, and so forth, and then sit at the feet of their Gamaliels to be initiated into the secrets of the Professorial chair, that they may in turn become Professors of those branches to classes of their own. Nor would such a plan, if it were possible, be altogether without its value. It surely needs no demonstration to prove, that in the highest departments, no less than in the lowest, something more than knowledge is needed in order to teach. An understanding of how to communicate one's knowledge, and practical skill in doing it, are as necessary in teaching theology, metaphysics, languages, infinitesimal analysis, or chemistry, as they are in teaching the alphabet. If there are bunglers, who know not how to go to work to teach a child its letters, or to open its young mind and heart to the reception of truth, whose school-rooms are places where the young mind and heart are in a state, either of perpetual torpor, or of perpetual nightmare, have these bunglers no analogues in the men of ponderous erudition that sometimes fill the Professor's chair? Have we no examples, in our highest seminaries of learning, of men very eminent in scientific attainments, who have not in themselves the first elements of a teacher? who impart to their students no quickening impulse? whose vast and towering knowledge may make them perhaps a grand feature in their College, attracting

to it all eyes, but whose intellectual treasures, for all the practical wants of the students, are of no more use, than are the swathed and buried mummies in the pyramid of Cheops!

A Teachers' Seminary, if it were complete, would include in its curriculum of study the entire cycle of human knowledge, so far as it is taught by schools. Our teachers of mathematics and of logic, of law and of medicine, need indeed a knowledge of the branches which they are to teach, and for this knowledge they do not need a Teachers' Seminary. But they need something more than this knowledge. Besides being men of erudition, they need to be teachers, no less than the humbler members of the profession, who have only to teach the alphabet and the multiplication table; and there is in all teaching, high or low, something that is common to them all—an art and a skill which is different from the mere knowledge of the subjects; which is not necessarily learned in learning the subjects; which requires special, superadded gifts, and distinct study and training. There is, according to our observation, as great a lack of this special skill in the higher seminaries of learning, as in the lower seminaries. Were it possible to have a Normal School, not which should undertake to teach the entire encyclopædia of the sciences, but which, limiting itself to its one main function of developing the art and mystery of communicating knowledge, should turn out College Professors, and even Divinity, Law, and Medical Professors,—men who were really skilful teachers,—it would work a change in those venerable institutions as marked and decisive as that which it is now effecting in the common schools. Of course, no such scheme is possible; certainly, none such is contemplated. But we are very sure we shall not be considered calumnious, when we express the conviction, that there are learned and eminent occupants of Professors' chairs, who might find great benefit in an occasional visit to a good Normal School, or even to the class-room of a teacher trained in a Normal School. We certainly have seen, in the very lowest department of the common school, a style of teaching, which, for a wise and intelligent comprehension of its object, and for its quickening power upon the intellect and conscience, would compare favourably with

the very best teaching we have ever seen in a College or University.

We come back, then, to the point from which we set out, namely, that a Normal School, or Teachers' Seminary, differs essentially from every other kind of school. It aims to give the knowledge and skill that are needed alike in all schools. To make the point a little plainer, let us restate, with what clearness we can, some of the elementary truths and facts which lie at the foundation of the whole subject. Though to many of our readers it may be going over a beaten track, it may not be so to all; and we all do well, even in regard to known and admitted truths, to bring them occasionally afresh to the mind.

As it has been already said, a man may know a thing perfectly, and yet not be able to teach it. Of course, a man cannot teach what he does not know. He must first have the knowledge. But the mere possession of knowledge does not make one a teacher, any more than the possession of powder and shot makes him a marksman, or the possession of a rod and line makes him an angler. The most learned men are often unfortunately the very men who have least capacity for communicating what they know. Nor is this incapacity confined to those versed in book knowledge. It is common to every class of men, and to every kind of knowledge. Let us give an example. The fact about to be stated, was communicated to us by a gentleman of eminent commercial standing in Philadelphia, now the President of one of its leading banks. The fact occurred in his own personal experience. He was, at the time of its occurrence, largely engaged in the cloth trade. His faculties of mind and body, and particularly his sense of touch, had been so trained in this business, that in going rapidly over an invoice of cloth, as his eye and hand passed in quick succession from piece to piece, in the most miscellaneous assortment, he could tell instantly the value of each, with a degree of precision, and a certainty of knowledge, hardly credible. A single glance of the eye, a single touch, transient as thought, gave the result. His own knowledge of the subject, in short, was perfect, and it was rapidly winning him a fortune. Yet when undertaking to explain to a younger and less expe-

rienced member of the craft whom he wished to befriend, by what process he arrived at his judgment, in other words, to teach what he knew, he found himself utterly at a loss. His thoughts had never run in that direction. "Oh!" said he, "you have only——to look at the cloth, and—and—to run your fingers over it,—thus. You will perceive at once the difference between one piece and another." It seems never to have occurred to him that another man's sensations and perceptions might in the same circumstances be quite different from his, and that in order to communicate his knowledge to one uninitiated, he must pause to analyse it; he must separate, classify, and name those several qualities of the cloth of which his senses took cognizance; he must then ascertain how far his interrogator perceived by his senses the same qualities which he himself did, and thus gradually get no common ground with him.

Let the receiving-teller of a bank be called upon to explain how it is that he knows at a glance a counterfeit bill from a genuine one, and in nine cases out of ten he will succeed no better than the cloth merchant did. Knowing and communicating what we know, doing and explaining what we do, are distinct, separable, and usually very different processes.

Similar illustrations might be drawn from artists, and from men of original genius in almost every profession, who can seldom give any intelligible account of how they achieve their results. The mental habits best suited for achievement are rarely those best suited for teaching. Marlborough, so celebrated for his military combinations, could never give any intelligible account of his plans. He had arrived at his conclusions with unerring certainty, but he was so little accustomed to observing his own mental processes, that he utterly failed in attempting to make them plain to others. He saw the points himself with perfect clearness, but he had no power to make others see them. To all objections to his plans, he could only say, "Silly, silly, that's silly." It was much the same with Oliver Cromwell. It is so with most men who are distinguished for action and achievement. Patrick Henry would doubtless have made but a third-rate teacher of elocution, and old Homer but an indifferent lecturer on the art of poetry.

To acquire knowledge ourselves, then, and to put others in possession of what we have acquired, are not only distinct intellectual processes, but they are quite unlike. In the former case, the faculties merely go out towards the objects to be known, as in the case of the cloth merchant passing his eye and finger over the bales of cloth. But in the case of one attempting to teach, several additional processes are needed, besides that of collecting knowledge. He must turn his thoughts inward, so as to arrange and classify properly the contents of his intellectual storehouse. He must then examine his own mind, his intellectual machinery, so as to understand exactly how the knowledge came in upon himself. He must lastly study the minds of his pupils, so as to know through what channels the knowledge may best reach them. The teacher may not always be aware that he does all these things, that is, he may not always have a theory of his own art. But the art itself he must have. He must first get the knowledge of the things to be taught; he must secondly study his knowledge; he must thirdly study himself; he must lastly study his pupil. He is a teacher at all only so far as he does at least these four things.

In a Normal School, as before said, the knowledge of the subject is presupposed. The object of the Normal School is, not so much to make arithmeticians and grammarians, for instance, as to make teachers of arithmetic and grammar. This teaching faculty is a thing by itself, and quite apart from the subject matter to be taught. It underlies every branch of knowledge, and every trade and profession. The theologian, the mathematician, the linguist, the learned professor, no less than the teacher of the primary school, or of the Sabbath-school, all need this supplementary knowledge and skill, in which consists the very essence of teaching. This knowledge of how to teach is not acquired by merely studying the subject to be taught. It is a study by itself. A man may read familiarly the *Mechanique Celeste*, and yet not know how to teach the multiplication table. He may read Arabic or Sanskrit, and not know how to teach a child the alphabet of his mother tongue. The Sabbath-school teacher may dip deep into biblical lore, he may ransack the commentaries, and may

become, as many Sabbath-school teachers are, truly learned in Bible knowledge, and yet be utterly incompetent to teach a class of children. He can no more hit the wandering attention, or make a lodgment of his knowledge in the minds of his youthful auditory, than the mere unskilled possessor of a fowling-piece can hit a bird upon the wing.

The art of teaching is the one indispensable qualification of the teacher. Without this, whatever else he may be, he is no teacher. How may this art be acquired? In the first place, many persons pick it up, just as they pick up a great many other arts and trades,—in a hap-hazard sort of way. They have some natural aptitude for it, and they grope their way along, by guess and by instinct, and through many failures, until they become good teachers, they hardly know how. To rescue the art from this condition of uncertainty and chance, is the object of the Normal School. In such a school, the main object of the pupil is to learn how to make others know what he himself knows. The whole current of his thoughts and studies is turned into this channel. Studying how to teach, with an experimental class to practise on, forms the constant topic of his meditations. It is surprising how rapidly, under such conditions, the faculty of teaching is developed; how fertile the mind becomes in devising practical expedients, when once the attention is roused and fixed upon the precise object to be attained, and the idea of what teaching really is, fairly has possession of the mind. In furtherance of this end, every well-ordered Normal School has, in connection with it, and as a part of its organization, a Model School, to serve the double purpose of a school of observation, and a school of practice. Thus, after these pupil-teachers are once thoroughly familiar with the branches to be taught, and after they have become acquainted with the theory of teaching, as a science, it is surprising how soon, with even a little of this practice-teaching, they acquire the art. If the faculty of teaching is in them at all, a very few experimental lessons, under the eye of an experienced teacher, will develope it. The fact of possessing within one's self the teaching gift, sometimes breaks upon the possessor himself with all the force of a surprising and most delightful discovery. The good teacher does not indeed stop

here. He goes on to improve in his art as long as he lives. But his greatest single achievement is when he takes the first step,—when he first learns to teach at all. The pupil of a Normal School gains there a start, an impulse which carries him forward the rest of his life. Thus a very little judicious experimental training redeems hundreds of candidates from utter and pitiful incompetency, and converts for them an awkward and painful drudgery into keen, hopeful, and productive labour.

But what is teaching? Unless our ideas on this point are clear and well defined, it is in vain to look for any satisfactory results. Teaching, then, in the first place, is not simply telling. A class may be told a thing twenty times over, and yet not know it. Talking to a class is not necessarily teaching. We have known many teachers, who were brimful of information, and were good talkers, and who discoursed to their classes with ready utterance a large part of the time allotted to instruction, yet an examination of their classes showed little advancement in knowledge.

There are several time-honoured metaphors on this subject, which need to be received with some grains of allowance, if we would get at an exact idea of what teaching is. Chiselling the rude marble into the finished statue, giving the impression of the seal upon the soft wax, pouring water into an empty vessel, —all these comparisons lack one essential element of likeness. The mind is indeed, in one sense, empty, and needs to be filled. It is yielding, and needs to be impressed. It is rude, and needs polishing. But it is not, like the marble, the wax, or the vessel, a passive recipient of external influences. It is itself a living power. It is acted upon only by stirring up its own activities. The operative upon mind, unlike the operative upon matter, must have the active, voluntary coöperation of that upon which he works. The teacher is doing his work, only so far as he gets work from the scholar. The very essence and root of the work are in the scholar, not in the teacher. No one, in fact, in an important sense, is taught at all, except so far as he is self-taught. The teacher may be useful, as an auxiliary, in causing this action on the part of the scholar. But the one, indisputable, vital thing, in all learning,

is in the scholar himself. The old Romans, in their word education, (*educere*, to draw out) seem to have come nearer to the true idea than any other people have done. The teacher is to draw out the resources of the pupil. Yet even this word comes short of the exact truth. The teacher must put in, as well as draw out. No process of mere pumping will draw out from a child's mind knowledge which is not there. All the power of the Socratic method, could it be applied by Socrates himself, would be unavailing to draw from a child's mind, by mere questioning, a knowledge, for instance, of chemical affinity, of the solar system, of the temperature of the Gulf Stream, of the doctrine of the resurrection.

What then is teaching? Teaching is causing any one to know. Now no one can be made to know a thing, but by the act of his own powers. His own senses, his own memory, his own powers of reason, perception, and judgment must be exercised. The function of the teacher is to bring about this exercise of the pupil's faculties. The means to do this are infinite in variety. They should be varied according to the wants and the character of the individual to be taught. One needs to be told a thing; he learns most readily by the ear. Another needs to use his eyes; he must see a thing, either in the book, or in nature. But neither eye nor ear, nor any other sense or faculty will avail to the acquisition of knowledge, unless the power of attention is cultivated. Attention, then, is the first act or power of the mind that must be roused. It is the very foundation of all progress in knowledge, and the means of awakening it constitute the first step in the educational art.

When by any means facts, positive knowledge, are once in possession of the mind, something must next be done to prevent their slipping away. You may tell a class the history of a certain event, or you may give them a description of a certain place, or person, or you may let them read it, and you may secure such a degree of attention, that at the time of the reading or the description, they shall have a fair, intelligible comprehension of what has been described or read. The facts are for the time actually in the possession of the mind. Now, if the mind was, according to the old notion, merely a vessel

to be filled, the process would be complete. But mind is not an empty vessel. It is a living essence, with powers and processes of its own. And experience shows us, that in the case of a class of undisciplined pupils, facts, even when fairly placed in the possession of the mind, often remain there about as long as the shadow of a passing cloud remains upon the landscape, and make about as much impression.

The teacher must seek then, not only to get knowledge into the mind, but to fix it there. In other words, the power of the memory must be strengthened. Teaching then, most truly, and in every stage of it, is a strictly coöperative process. You cannot cause any one to know, by merely pouring out stores of knowledge in his hearing, any more than you can make his body grow by spreading the contents of your market-basket at his feet. You must rouse his power of attention, that he may lay hold of, and receive, and make his own, the knowledge you offer him. You must awaken and strengthen the power of memory within him, that he may retain what he receives, and thus grow in knowledge, as the body by a like process grows in strength and muscle. In other words, learning, so far as the mind of the learner is concerned, is a growth; and teaching, so far as the teacher is concerned, is doing whatever is necessary to cause that growth.

Let us proceed a step farther in this matter. One of the ancients observes that a lamp loses none of its own light by allowing another lamp to be lit from it. He uses the illustration to enforce the duty of liberality in imparting our knowledge to others. Knowledge, he says, unlike other treasures, is not diminished by giving.

The illustration fails to express the whole truth. This imparting of knowledge to others, not only does not impoverish the donor, but it actually increases his riches. *Docendo discimus.* By teaching we learn. A man grows in knowledge by the very act of communicating it. The reason for this is obvious. In order to communicate to the mind of another a thought which is in our own mind, we must give to the thought definite shape and form. We must handle it and pack it up for safe conveyance. Thus the mere act of giving a thought expression in words, fixes it more deeply in our own minds.

Not only so, we can, in fact, very rarely be said to be in full possession of a thought ourselves, until by the tongue or the pen we have communicated it to somebody else. The expression of it, in some form, seems necessary to give it, even in our own minds, a definite shape and a lasting impression. A man who devotes himself to solitary reading and study, but never tries in any way to communicate his acquisitions to the world, or to enforce his opinions upon others, rarely becomes a learned man. A great many confused, dreamy ideas, no doubt, float through the brain of such a man. But he has little exact and reliable knowledge. The truth is, there is a sort of indolent, listless absorption of intellectual food, that tends to idiocy. We knew a person once, a gentleman of wealth and leisure, who having no taste for social intercourse, and no material wants to be supplied, which might have required the active exercise of his powers, gave himself up entirely to solitary reading, as a sort of luxurious self-indulgence. He shut himself up in his room, all day long, day after day, devouring one book after another, until he became almost idiotic by the process, and he finally died of softening of the brain. Had he been compelled to use his mental acquisitions in earning his bread, or had the love of Christ constrained him to use them in the instruction of the poor and the ignorant, he might have become not only a useful, but a learned man.

We see a beautiful illustration of this doctrine in the case of Sabbath-school teachers, and one reason why persons so engaged usually love their work, is the benefit which they find in it for themselves. We speak here, not of the spiritual, but of the intellectual benefit. By the process of teaching others, they are all the while learning. This advantage in their case is all the greater, because it advances them in a kind of knowledge in which, more than in any other kind of knowledge, men are wont to become passive and stationary. In ordinary worldly knowledge, our necessities make us active. The intercourse of business and of pleasure even, makes men keen. On these subjects we are all the while bandying thoughts to and fro, we are accustomed to give as well as take, and so we keep our intellectual armor bright, and our thoughts well defined. But in regard to growth in scriptural knowledge, we have a tendency

to be mere passive recipients, like the young man just referred to. Sabbath after Sabbath we hear good, instructive, orthodox discourses, but there is no active putting forth of our own powers in giving out what we thus take in, and so we never make it effectually our own. The absorbing process goes on, and yet we make no growth. The quiescent audience is a sort of exhausted receiver, into which the stream from the pulpit is perennially playing, but never making it full. Let a man go back and ask himself, what actual scriptural knowledge have I gained by the sermons of the last six months? What in fact do I retain in my mind, at this moment, of the sermons I heard only last Sabbath? So far as the hearing of sermons is concerned, the Sabbath-school teacher may perhaps be no better off than other hearers. But in regard to general growth in Biblical knowledge, he advances more rapidly than his fellow worshippers, because the exigencies of his class compel him to a state of mind the very opposite of this passive recipiency. He is obliged to be all the while, not only learning, but putting his acquisitions into definite shape for use, and the very act of using these acquisitions in teaching a class, fixes them in his own mind, and makes them more surely his own.

We have used this instance of the Sabbath-school teacher because it enforces an important hint already given, as to the mode of teaching. Some teachers, especially in Sabbath-schools, seem to be ambitious to do a great deal of talking. The measure of their success, in their own eyes, is their ability to keep up a continued stream of talk for the greater part of the hour. This is of course better than the embarrassing silence semetimes seen, where neither teacher nor scholar has anything to say. But at the best, it is only pouring into the exhausted receiver enacted over again. We can never be reminded too often, that there is no teaching except so far as there is active coöperation on the part of the learner. The mind receiving must reproduce and give back what it gets. This is the indispensable condition of making any knowledge really our own. The very best teaching we have ever seen, has been where the teacher said comparatively little. The teacher was of course brimful of the subject. He could give the needed information at exactly the right point, and in the right

quantity. But for every word given by the teacher, there were many words of answering reproduction on the part of the scholars. Youthful minds under such tutelage grow apace.

It is indeed a high and difficult achievement in the educational art, to get young persons thus to bring forth their thoughts freely for examination and correction. A pleasant countenance and a gentle manner, inviting and inspiring confidence, have something to do with the matter. But, whatever the means for accomplishing this end, the end itself is indispensable. The scholar's tongue must be unloosed, as well as the teacher's. The scholar's thoughts must be broached as well as the teacher's. Indeed, the statement needs very little qualification or abatement, that a scholar has learned nothing from us except what he has expressed to us again in words. The teacher who is accustomed to harangue his scholars with a continuous stream of words, no matter how full of weighty meaning his words may be, is yet deceiving himself, if he thinks that his scholars are materially benefitted by his intellectual activity, unless it is so guided as to awaken and exercise theirs. If, after a suitable period, he will honestly examine his scholars on the subjects, on which he has himself been so productive, he will find that he has been only pouring water into a seive. Teaching can never be this one-sided process. Of all the things we attempt, it is the one most essentially and necessarily a coöperative process. There must be the joint action of the teacher's mind and the scholar's mind. A teacher teaches at all, only so far as he causes this co-active energy of the pupil's mind.

It cannot be too often repeated, the measure of a teacher's success, is not what he himself does, but what he gets his scholars to do. In nothing is this more noticeable, than in the different modes of putting a question to a scholar. One teacher will put a question in such a manner as to find out exactly how much or how little of the subject the child knows, and thereby encourage careful preparation; to give the pupil an open door, if he really knows the subject, to express his knowledge in a way that will be a satisfaction and pleasure to him; to improve his power of expression, to cultivate his memory, to increase his knowledge, and to make it more thorough and definite.

Another teacher will put his questions so as to secure none of these ends, but on the contrary so as to induce a most lamentable degree of carelessness and inaccuracy. Let us illustrate this point, taking our example for greater convenience from a scriptural subject. Suppose it to be a lesson upon Christ's temptation, as recorded in the 4th chapter of Matthew. The dialogue between teacher and scholar may be supposed to proceed somewhat in this wise:

Teacher. Who was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil?

Pupil. Jesus.

T. Yes. Now, when Jesus had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward a—— what? How did he feel after that?

P. Hungry.

T. Yes, that is right. He was afterward "ahungered," how then?—the next scholar. Who then came to Jesus and said, if thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread?

(Scholar hesitates.)

T. The t——?

P. The tempter.

T. Yes, you are right. It was the tempter. Who do you think is meant by the tempter?—the devil?

P. Yes.

T. When a man has fasted, that is, has eaten nothing, for forty days and forty nights, and feels very hungry, would the suggestion of an easy mode of getting food be likely to be a strong temptation to him, or would it not?

P. It would.

T. Yes, you are right again. It would be a strong temptation to him.

We need not pursue this dialogue further. The reader will see at once how there may thus be the appearance of quite a brisk and fluent recitation, to which however the pupil contributes absolutely nothing. It requires nothing of him in the way of preparation, and only the most indolent and profitless use of his faculties while reciting. He could hardly answer amiss, unless he were an idiot, and yet he has the appearance,

and he is often flattered into the belief, of having given some evidence of knowledge and proficiency.

The opposite extreme from the method just exhibited, is that known as the topical method. It is the method pursued in the higher classes of schools, and among more advanced students. In the topical method, the teacher propounds a topic or subject, sometimes in the form of a question, but more commonly only by a title, a mere word or two, and then calls upon the pupil to give, in his own words, a full and connected narration or explanation of the subject, such as the teacher himself would give, if called upon to narrate or explain it. The subject already suggested, if propounded topically, would be somewhat in this wise:

The first temptation of Jesus.

Or, more fully: Narrate the circumstances of the first temptation of Jesus, and show wherein his virtue was particularly tried in that transaction.

The teacher, having propounded the subject clearly to the class, then waits patiently, maintaining silence himself, and requiring the members of the class to be silent and attentive, until the pupil interrogated is quite through, not hurrying him, not interrupting him, even with miscalled helps and hints, but leaving him to the free and independent action of his own faculties, in giving as full, connected, and complete an account of the matter as he can. When the pupil is quite through, the teacher then, but not before, makes any corrections or additional statements that may seem to be needed. In such an exercise as this, the pupil finds the absolute necessity of full and ample preparation; he has a powerful and healthy stimulus thus to prepare, in the intellectual satisfaction which one always feels in the successful discharge of any difficult task; and he acquires a habit of giving complete and accurate expression to his knowledge, by means of entire sentences, and without the help of "catch words," or leading-strings of any kind.

Some classes, of course, are not sufficiently advanced to carry out fully the method here explained. But there are many intermediate methods, founded on the same principle, and suited to children in every stage of advancement. Only let it be understood, whatever the stage, that the object of the

recitation is, not to show what the teacher can say or do, but to secure the right thing being said and done by the pupil.

To recur once more to the same subject, the temptation of Christ. For a very juvenile class, the questioning might proceed on this wise:

T. Where was Jesus led after his baptism?

P. He was led into the wilderness.

T. By whom was he led there?

P. He was led by the Spirit.

T. For what purpose was he led into the wilderness?

P. He was led into the wilderness to be tempted.

T. By whom was he to be tempted?

P. He was to be tempted by the devil.

T. What bodily want was made the means of his first temptation?

If the class is quite young, and this question seems too difficult, the teacher, instead of asking it, or after asking it and not getting a satisfactory answer, might say to his class, that Jesus was first tempted through the sense of hunger. He was very hungry, and the devil suggested to him an improper means of relieving himself from the inconvenience. He might then go on with some such questions as these:

T. What circumstance is mentioned as showing how very hungry he must have been?

P. He had fasted forty days and forty nights.

T. Mention any way in which *you* might be tempted to sin, if you were suffering from hunger?

The foregoing questions, it will be perceived, are very simple, being suited to scholars just advanced beyond the infant class. Yet no one of the questions, in its form, or terms, necessarily suggests the answer. No one of them can be answered by a mere "yes" or "no." No scholar, unacquainted with the subject, and with his book closed, can guess at the answer from the way in which the question is put. Not a question has been given, simple as they all are, which does not require at least some preparation, and which does not, to some extent, give exercise to the pupil's memory, his judgment, and his capacity for expression.

If the class is more advanced, the questions may be varied,

so as to task and exercise these faculties more seriously. For instance, the teacher of a class somewhat older might be imagined to begin the exercise thus:

T. After the baptism of Jesus, which closes the 3d chapter of Matthew, we have an account of several temptations to which he was exposed. Now, open your books at the 4th chapter, and see if you can find out how many verses are occupied with the narrative of these temptations, and at what verse each temptation begins.

The teacher then requires all the class to search in silence, and each one to get ready to answer, but lets no answer be given until all are prepared. When all have signified their readiness, some one is designated to give the answer.

The books being closed, the questioning begins:

T. Name the different places into which Jesus was taken to be tempted, and the verse in which each place is named.

P. It is said in the 1st verse that Jesus was led up into the wilderness; in the 5th verse, that he was taken up into the holy city, and set on a pinnacle of the temple; and in the 8th verse, that he was taken up into an exceedingly high mountain.

T. What was the condition of Jesus, when the devil proposed his first temptation?

P. He had been fasting forty days and forty nights, and he was very hungry.

We need not multiply these illustrations. We have not made them entirely in vain, if we have succeeded in producing in the mind of the reader the conviction of these two things; first, that it is a most important and difficult part of the teacher's art, to know how to ask a question; and secondly, that the true measure of the teacher's ability is, not so much what he himself is able to say to the scholars, as the fulness, the accuracy, and the completeness of the answers which he gets from them.

Before leaving this part of the subject, and that there may be no possible misunderstanding on these elementary points, it seems proper that we should here explain briefly the difference between teaching and training, two processes which practically run into each other a good deal, but which nevertheless ought

not to be confounded. Training implies more or less of practical application of what one has been taught. One may be taught, for instance, the exact forms of the letters used in writing, so as to know at once by the eye whether the letters are formed correctly or not. But only training and practice will make him a penman. Training refers more to the formation of habits. A child may be taught by reasoning the importance of punctuality in coming to school. But he is trained to the habit of punctuality only by actually coming to school in good time, day after day.

The human machine on which the teacher acts, is in its essential nature different from the material agencies operated on by other engineers. It is, as we have once and again said, a living power, with laws and processes of its own. Constant care, therefore, must be exercised, in the business of education, not to be misled by analogies drawn from the material world. The steam engine may go over its appointed task, day after day, the whole year round, and yet, at the end of the year, it will have no more tendency to go than before its first trip. Not so the boy. Going begets going. By doing a thing often, he acquires a facility, an inclination, a tendency, a habit of doing it. If a teacher or a parent succeeds in getting a child to do a thing once, it will be easier to get him to do it a second time, and still easier a third time.

A teacher who is wise, when he seeks to bring about any given change in a child, whether it be intellectual or moral, will not ordinarily attempt to produce the change all at once, and by main force. He will not rely upon extravagant promises on the one side, nor upon scolding, threats, and violence on the other. Solomon hits the idea exactly, when he speaks of "leading in the way of righteousness." We must take the young by the hand and lead them. When we have led them over the ground once, let us do it a second time, and then a third time, and so keep on until we shall have established with them a routine, which they will continue to follow of their own accord, when the guiding hand which first led them is withdrawn. *This is training.*

The theory of it is true, not only in regard to things to be done, which is generally admitted, but also in regard to things

to be known, which is often ignored if not denied. A boy, we will say, has a repugnance to the study of arithmetic. Perhaps he is particularly dull of comprehension on that subject. We shall not remove that repugnance by railing at him. We shall never make him admire it by expatiating on its beauties. It will not become clear to his comprehension by our pouring upon it all at once a sudden and overpowering blaze of light in the way of explanation. Such a process rather confounds him. Here again let us fall back upon the method of the great Teacher, "Line upon line, precept upon precept." We will first patiently conduct our boy through one of the simplest operations of arithmetic, say, a sum in addition. The next day we will conduct him again through the same process, or through another of the same sort. The steps will gradually become familiar to his mind, then easy, then clear. He learns first the practice of arithmetic, then the rules, then the relations of numbers, then the theory on which the rules and the practice are based, and finally, he hardly knows how, he becomes an arithmetician. He has been trained into a knowledge of the subject.

You wish to teach a young child how to find a word in a dictionary. You give at first, perhaps, a verbal description of the mystery of a dictionary. You will tell him that, in such a book, all the words are arranged according to the letters with which they begin; that all the words beginning with the letter A are in the first part of the book. Then those beginning with the letter B, then those beginning with C, and so on; you tell him that all the words beginning with one letter, covering some one or two hundred pages, are again re-arranged among themselves according to the second letter of each word, and then again still further re-arranged according to the third letter in each, and so on to the end. Arouse his utmost attention, and explain the process with the greatest clearness that words can give, and then set him to find a word. See how awkward will be his first attempt, how confused his ideas, how little he has really understood what you have told him. You must repeat your directions patiently, over and over, "line upon line"; you must take him by the hand day after day, and train him into a

knowledge of even so apparently simple a thing as finding a word in a dictionary.

While teaching and training are thus distinguishable in theory, in practice they are well nigh inseparable. At least, they never should be separated. Teaching has never done its perfect work, until, by training, the mind has learned to run in accustomed channels, until it sees what is true, and feels what is right, with the clearness, force, and promptitude, which come only from long-continued habit.

Supposing a man to know clearly what teaching is, and to have himself the gift, how endless are the modes by which it is to be exercised! How numerous are the methods of doing even that one function of the teacher's office, the hearing of recitations! Suppose we spend a few moments in considering two or three of these modes, by way of still farther illustrating the subject, and before drawing the general conclusion to which all these illustrations point.

The first that we shall name is called the concert method. This is practised chiefly in schools for very young children, especially for those who cannot read. There are many advantages in this method, some of which are not confined to infant classes. The timid, who are frightened by the sound of their own voices when attempting to recite alone, are thereby encouraged to speak out, and those who have had any experience with such children, know that this is no small, or easy, or unimportant achievement. Another benefit of the method is the pleasure it gives the children. The measured noise and motion connected with such concert exercises, are particularly attractive to young children. Moreover, one good teacher, by the use of this method, may greatly multiply his efficiency. He may teach simultaneously fifty or sixty, instead of teaching only five or six. But in estimating this advantage, one error is to be guarded against. Visitors often hear a large class of fifty or more go through an exercise of this kind, in which the scholars have been drilled to recite in concert, and if such persons have never been accustomed to investigate the fact, they often suppose that the answers given are the intelligent responses of all the members of the class. The truth is, however, in very many such cases, that only some half-dozen or so

really recite the answers from their own independent knowledge. These serve as leaders; the others, sheep-like, follow. Still by frequent repetition, even in this blind way, something gradually sticks to the memory, although the impression is always apt to be vague and undefined.

The method of reciting in concert is, in our opinion, chiefly useful in reciting rules and definitions, or other matters, where the very words are to be committed to memory. The impression of so large a body of sound upon the ear is very strong, and is a great help in the matter of mere verbal recollection. Children too are very sympathetic, and a really skilful teacher, by the concert method, can do a great deal in cultivating the emotional nature of a large class.

Young children, too, it should be remembered, like all other young animals, are by nature restless and fidgetty, and like to make a noise. It is possible, indeed, by a system of rigorous and harsh repression, to restrain this restlessness, and to keep these little ones for hours in such a state of decorous primness as not to molest weak nerves. But such a system of forced constraint is not natural to children, and is not a wise method of teaching. Let the youngsters make a noise; we had almost said, the more noise the better, so it be duly regulated. Let them exercise, not only their lungs, but their limbs, moving in concert, rising up, sitting down, turning round, marching, raising their hands, pointing to objects to which their attention is called, looking at objects which are shown to them. Movement and noise are the life of a child. They should be regulated indeed, but not repressed. To make a young child sit still and keep silence for any great length of time, is next door to murder. We verily believe it sometimes is murder. The health, and even the lives of these little ones, are sacrificed to a false theory of teaching. There is no occasion for torturing a child in order to teach him. God did not so mean it. Only let your teaching be in accordance with the wants of his young nature, and the schoolroom will be to him the most attractive spot of all the earth. Time and again have we seen the teacher of a primary school obliged at recess to compel her children to go out of doors, so much more pleasant did they find the schoolroom than the play-ground.

Quite the opposite extreme from the concert method, is that which, for convenience, may be called the individual method. In this method, the teacher examines one scholar alone upon the whole lesson, and then another, and so on, until the class is completed.

The only advantage claimed for this method is that the individual laggard cannot screen his deficiencies, as he can when reciting in concert. He cannot make believe to know the lesson by lazily joining in with the general current of voice when the answers are given. His own individual knowledge, or ignorance, stands out. This is clear, and so far it is an advantage. But ascertaining what a pupil knows of a lesson, is only one end, and that by no means the most important end of a recitation. This interview between the pupil and teacher, called a recitation, has many ends besides that of merely detecting how much of a subject the pupil knows. A far higher end is to make him know more,—to make perfect that knowledge which the most faithful preparation on the part of the pupil always leaves incomplete.

The disadvantages of the individual method are obvious. It is a great waste of time. If a teacher has a class of twenty, and an hour to hear them in, it gives him but three minutes for each pupil, supposing there are no interruptions. But we know there always are interruptions. In public schools the class oftener numbers forty than twenty, and the time for recitation is oftener half an hour than an hour. The teacher who pursues the individual method to its extreme, will rarely find himself in possession of more than one minute to each scholar. In so brief a time, very little can be ascertained as to what the scholar knows of the lesson, and still less can anything be done to increase that knowledge. Moreover, while the teacher is bestowing his small modicum of time upon one scholar, all the other members of the class are idle, or worse.

Teaching, of all kinds of labour, is that in which labour-saving and time-saving methods are of the greatest moment. The teacher who is wise, will aim so to conduct a recitation that, first, his whole time shall be given to every scholar; and secondly, the scholar's mind shall be exercised with every part of the lesson, and just as much when others are reciting, as

when it is his own time to recite. A teacher who can do this is teaching every scholar, all the time, just as much as if he had no scholar but that one.

Even this does not state the whole case. A scholar in such a class learns more in a given time, than he would if he were alone, and the teacher's entire time were given exclusively to him. The human mind is wonderfully quickened by sympathy. In a crowd each catches, in some mysterious manner, an impulse from his fellows. The influence of associated numbers, all engaged upon the same thought, is universally to rouse the mind to a higher exercise of its powers. A mind that is dull, lethargic, and heavy in its movements, when moving solitarily, often effects, when under a social and sympathetic impulse, achievements that are a wonder to itself.

The teacher, then, who knows how thus to make a unit of twenty or thirty pupils, really multiplies himself twenty or thirty-fold, besides giving to the whole class an increased momentum such as always belongs to an aggregated mass. We have seen a teacher instruct a class of forty in such a way, as, in the first place, to secure the subordinate end of ascertaining and registering with a sufficient degree of exactness how much each scholar knows of the lesson by his own preparation, and secondly, to secure, during the whole hour, the active exercise and coöperation of each individual mind, under the powerful stimulus of the social instinct, and of a keenly awakened attention. Such a teacher accomplishes more in one hour than the slave of the individual method can accomplish in forty hours. A scholar in such a class learns more in one hour than he would learn in forty hours, in a class of equal numbers taught on the other plan. Such teaching is labour-saving and time-saving, in their highest perfection, employed upon the noblest of ends.

But besides these questions of methods, there are other and higher questions, growing out of what may be called the philosophy of education. One of these relates to the observance of a proper order in the development of the mental faculties, and a mistake on this point leads often to a sad waste of time, even where it does not cause a mischievous perversion of ideas. Education may be defined to be the process

of developing in due order and proportion all the good and desirable parts of human nature. On this point all educators are substantially agreed. Another truth, to which there is a general theoretical assent, is that, in the order in which we develope the faculties, we should follow the leadings of nature, cultivating in childhood those faculties which seem most naturally to flourish in childish years, and reserving for maturer years the cultivation of those faculties which in the order of nature do not show much vigor until near the age of manhood, and which require for their full development a general ripening of all the other powers. The development of a human being is in some respects like that of a plant. There is one stage of growth suitable for the appearance and maturity of the leaf, another for the flower, a third for the fruit, and still a fourth for the perfected and ripened seed.

The analogy has of course many limitations. In the human plant, for instance, one class of faculties, after maturing, does not disappear in order to make place for another class, as the flower disappears before there can be fruit. Nor, again, is any class of faculties wanting altogether until the season for their development and maturity. The faculties all exist together, leaf, flower, fruit, and seed, at the same time, but each has its own best time for ripening.

While these principles have received the general assent of educators, there has been a wide divergence among them as to some of the practical applications. Which faculties do most naturally ripen early in life, and which late in life?

According to our own observation, the latest of the human powers in maturing, as it is the most consummate, is the Judgment. Next in the order of maturity, and next also in majesty and excellence, is the Reasoning power. Reason is minister to the judgment, furnishing to the latter materials for its action, as all the other powers, memory, fancy, imagination, and so forth, are ministers to reason, and supply it with its materials. The reasoning power lacks true vigor and muscle, the judgment is little to be relied on, until we approach manhood. Nature withholds from these faculties an earlier development, for the very reason, apparently, that they can ordinarily have but scanty materials for action until after the efflorescence of the

other faculties. The mind must first be well filled with knowledge, which the other faculties have gathered and stored, before reason and judgment can have full scope for action.

Going to the other end of the scale, we have as little doubt that the earliest of all the faculties to bud and blossom, is the Memory. Children not only commit to memory with ease, but they take actual pleasure in it. Tasks, under which the grown-up man recoils and reels, the child will assume with light heart, and execute without fatigue. Committing to memory, which is repulsive drudgery to the man, is the easiest of all tasks to the child. More than this. The things fixed in the memory of childhood are seldom forgotten. Things learned later in life, not only are learned with greater difficulty, but more rapidly disappear. We recall instantly and without effort, texts of Scripture, hymns, catechisms, rules of grammar and arithmetic, and scraps of poetry and of classic authors, with which we became familiar when boys. But it is a labour of Hercules to repeat by memory anything acquired since attaining the age of manhood. The Creator seems to have arranged an order in the natural development of the faculties for this very purpose, that in childhood and youth we may be chiefly occupied with the accumulation of materials in our intellectual storehouse. Now to reverse this process, to occupy the immature mind of childhood chiefly with the cultivation of faculties which are of later growth, and actually to put shackles and restraints upon the memory, nicknaming and ridiculing all memoriter exercises as parrot performances, is to ignore one of the primary facts of human nature. It is to be wiser than God.

Another faculty that shoots up into full growth in the very morning and spring-time of life, is Faith. We speak here, of course, not of religious belief, but of that faculty of the human mind which leads a child to believe instinctively whatever is told him. That we all do thus believe, until by slow and painful experience we learn to do otherwise, needs no demonstration. Everybody's experience attests the fact. It is equally plain that the existence and maturity of this faculty in early childhood is a most wise and beneficent provision of nature. How slow and tedious would be the first steps in knowledge, were the child born, as some teachers seem trying to make him,

a sceptic, that is, with a mind which refuses to receive anything as true, except what it has first proved by experience and reason! On the contrary, how much is the acquisition of knowledge expedited, during these years of helplessness and dependency, by this spontaneous, instinctive faith of childhood. The same infinite wisdom and love, which in the order of nature provide for the helpless infant a father and mother to care for it, provide also in the constitution of the infant's mind that instinctive principle or power of faith, which alone makes the father's and mother's love efficacious towards its intellectual growth and development. Of what use were parents or teachers, in instructing a child which required proof for every statement that father, mother, or teacher gives? How cruel to force the confiding young heart into premature scepticism, by compelling him to hunt up reasons for everything, when he has reasons, to him all-sufficient, in the fact that father, mother, or teacher told him so?

It may seem trifling to dwell so long upon these elementary points. Yet there are wide-spread plans of education which violate every principle here laid down. Educators and systems of education, enjoying the highest popularity, seem to have adopted the theory, at least they tacitly act upon the theory, that the first faculty of the mind to be developed is the Reasoning power. Indeed, they are not far from asserting that the whole business of education consists in the cultivation of this power, and they bend accordingly their main energies upon training young children to go through certain processes of reasoning, so called. They require a child to prove everything before receiving it as true, to reason out a rule for himself for every process in arithmetic or grammar, to demonstrate the multiplication table before daring to use it, or to commit it to memory, if indeed they do not forbid entirely its being committed to memory as too parrot-like and mechanical. To commit blindly to memory precious forms of truth, which the wise and good have hived for the use of the race, is poohed at as old fogyish. To receive as true anything which the child cannot fathom, and which he has not discovered or demonstrated for himself, is denounced as slavish. All authority in teaching, growing out of the age and the reputed wisdom of the teacher,

all faith and reverence in the learner, growing out of a sense of his ignorance and dependence, are discarded, and the frightened stripling is continually rapped on the knuckles, if he does not at every step show the truth of his allegations by what is called a course of reasoning. Children reason, of course. They should be encouraged and taught to reason. No teacher, who is wise, will neglect this part of a child's intellectual powers. But he will not consider this the season for its main, normal development. He will hold this subject for the present subordinate to many others. Moreover, the methods of reasoning, which he does adopt, will be of a peculiar kind, suited to the nature of childhood, the results being mainly intuitional, rather than the fruits of formal logic. To oblige a young child to go through a formal syllogistic statement in every step in elementary arithmetic, for instance, is simply absurd. It makes nothing plain to a child's mind which was not plain before. On the contrary, it often makes a muddle of what had been perfectly clear. What was in the clear sunlight of intuition, is now in a haze, through the intervening medium of logical terms and forms, through which he is obliged to look at it.

A primary teacher asks her class this question: "If I can buy 6 marbles with 1 penny, how many marbles can I buy with 5 pennies?" A bright boy who should promptly answer "30" would be sharply rebuked. Little eight-year old Solon on the next bench has been better trained than that. With stately and solemn enunciation he delivers himself of a performance somewhat of this sort. "If I can buy 6 marbles with 1 penny, how many marbles can I buy with 5 pennies? Answer—I can buy 5 times as many marbles with 5 pennies as I can buy with 1 penny. If, therefore, I can buy 6 marbles with 1 penny, I can buy 5 times as many marbles with 5 pennies; and 5 times 6 marbles are 30 marbles. Therefore, if I can buy 6 marbles with 1 penny, I can buy 30 marbles with 5 pennies."

And this is termed reasoning! And to train children, by forced and artificial processes, to go through such a rigmarole of words, is recommended as a means of cultivating their reasoning power and of improving their power of expression! It is not pretended that children by such a process become more expert in reckoning. On the contrary, their movements as

ready reckoners are rather retarded by it. Instead of learning to jump at once to the conclusion, lightning-like, by a sort of intuitional process, which is of the very essence of an expert accountant, they learn laboriously to stay their march by a cumbersome and confusing circumlocution of words. And the expenditure of time and toil needed to acquire these formulas of expression, which nine times out of ten are to those young minds the mere *dicta magistri*, is justified on the ground that the children, if not learning arithmetic, are learning to reason.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not advocate the disuse of explanations. Let teachers explain, let children give explanations. Let the rationale of the various processes through which the child goes, receive a certain amount of attention. But the extreme into which some are now going, in primary education, is that of giving too much time to explanation and to theory, and too little to practice. We reverse, too, the order of nature in this matter. What it now takes weeks and months to make clear to the immature understanding, is apprehended at a later day with ease and delight at the very first statement. There is a clear and consistent philosophy underlying this whole matter. It is simply this. In the healthy and natural order of development in educating a young mind, theory should follow practice, not precede it. Children learn the practice of arithmetic very young. They take to it naturally, and learn it easily, and become very rapidly expert practical accountants. But the science of arithmetic is quite another matter, and should not be forced upon them until a much later stage in their advancement.

To have a really correct apprehension of the principle of decimal notation, for instance, to understand that it is purely arbitrary, and that we might in the same way take any other number than ten as the base of a numerical scale,—that we might increase for instance by fives, or eights, or nines, or twelves, just as well as by tens—all this requires considerable maturity of intellect, and some subtlety of reasoning. Indeed we doubt whether many of the pretentious sciolists, who insist so much on young children giving the rationale of everything, have themselves ever yet made an ultimate analysis of the first step in arithmetical notation. Many of them would open their

eyes were you to tell them, for instance, that the number of figures on your two hands may be just as correctly expressed by the figures 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15, as by the figures 10,—a truism perfectly familiar to every one acquainted with the generalizations of higher arithmetic. Yet it is up-hill work to make the matter quite clear to a beginner. We may wisely therefore give our children at first an arbitrary rule for notation. We give them an equally arbitrary rule for addition. They accept these rules and work upon them, and learn thereby the practical operations of arithmetic. The theory will follow in due time. When perfectly familiar with the practice and the forms of arithmetic, and sufficiently mature in intellect, they awaken gradually and surely, and almost without an effort, to the beautiful logic which underlies the science.

How do we learn language in childhood? Is it not solely on authority and by example? A child who lives in a family where no language is used but that which is logically and grammatically correct, will learn to speak with logical and grammatical correctness long before it is able to give any account of the processes of its own mind in the matter, or indeed to understand those processes when explained by others. In other words, practice in language precedes theory. It should do so in other things. The parent who should take measures to prevent a child from speaking its mother tongue, except just so far and so fast as it could understand and explain the subtle logic which underlies all language, would be quite as wise as the teacher who refuses to let a child become expert in practical reckoning, until it can understand and explain at every step the rationale of the process,—who will not suffer a child to learn the multiplication table until it has mastered the metaphysics of the science of numbers, and can explain with the formalities of syllogism exactly how and why seven times nine make sixty-three.

These illustrations have carried us a little, perhaps, from our subject. But they seemed necessary to show that we are not beating the air. We have feared lest, in our very best schools, in the rebound from the exploded errors of the old system, we have unconsciously run into an error in the opposite extreme.

Our position on the particular point now under consideration,

may be summed up briefly, as follows: 1. In developing the faculties, we should follow the order of nature. 2. The faculties of memory and faith should be largely exercised and cultivated in childhood. 3. While the judgment and the reasoning faculty should be exercised during every stage of the intellectual development, the appropriate season for their main development and culture is near the close, rather than near the beginning, of an educational course. 4. The methods of reasoning used with children should be of a simple kind, dealing largely in direct intuitions, rather than formal and syllogistic. 5. It is a mistake to spend a large amount of time and effort in requiring young children formally to explain the rationale of their intellectual processes, and especially in requiring them to give such explanations before they have become by practice thoroughly familiar with the processes themselves.

We have thus endeavoured to set forth, in the first place, what a Normal School is, namely, a seminary for professional training in the art and science of teaching; and, secondly, to show, with some particularity and variety of illustration, what teaching is, in its very root and essence; and, to make the matter plainer, we have attempted to show the difference between teaching and training, and to explain some two or three out of very many different modes of teaching, and to discuss briefly one of the many points that are involved in the philosophy of education. Some distinct consideration of these subjects, which come up continually for discussion in a Normal School, seemed to be the very best line of argument for showing the necessity of such an institution. To appreciate the full force of this argument, it would be necessary, indeed, to consider the vast array of similar and connected subjects which beset the teacher's path, and which there is not time now even to enumerate. Let us merely name some few of these subjects.

The Monitorial method of teaching.

The Catechetical method.

The Explanatory method.

The Synthetical method.

The Analytical method.

Modes of securing in a large school all the while something for all the children to do.

Modes of teaching particular branches: as Spelling, Reading, Mental Arithmetic, Written Arithmetic, Grammar, Geography, Composition, Drawing, Penmanship, Vocal Music, &c.

School apparatus and means for visible illustration.

The development and cultivation of the faculties of observation, attention, memory, association, conception, imagination, &c.

Modes of inspiring scholars with enthusiasm in study, and of cultivating habits of self-reliance.

Topics and times for introducing oral instruction.

Teaching with and without books.

Object Teaching.

The formation of museums, and collections of plants, minerals, &c.

Exchange of specimens of penmanship, maps, drawings, minerals, &c., with other schools.

School examinations. Their object, and the different modes of conducting them.

School celebrations, festivals, and excursions.

The daily preparation which a teacher should make for school.

Circumstances which make a teacher happy in his work.

Requisites for success in teaching.

Causes of failure in teaching.

Course to be pursued in organizing a new school.

Course to be pursued in admitting new scholars.

Making an order of exercises.

Making a code of rules.

Keeping registers of attendance and progress.

Duties of the teacher to the parents and to school directors.

Opening and closing exercises of a school.

Moral and religious instruction and influences.

Modes of cultivating among children a love of truth, honesty, benevolence, and other virtues.

Modes of preventing lying, swearing, stealing, and other vices.

Modes of securing cleanliness of person, neatness of dress, courtesy of language, and gentleness of manners.

Modes of preserving the school-house and appurtenances from defacement.

Keeping the school-room in proper condition as to temperature and ventilation.

Length of school day.

Length and frequency of recess.

Games to be encouraged or discouraged at recess.

Modes of preventing tardiness.

Causes by which the health of children at school is promoted or injured.

Modes of establishing the teacher's authority.

Modes of securing the scholars' affections.

Mode of treating refractory children.

Modes of bringing forward dull, backward children.

Modes of preventing whispering.

The use of emulation.

Prizes and rewards.

But we pause. The mere enumeration of such a list, it seems to us, shows of itself, with overwhelming force, how urgent is the necessity that the teacher should have a time and an institution for considering them, and for obtaining in regard to them definite, well settled views. Some of these questions come up for practical decision every day of a teacher's life, and they are of too serious import to be left to the unpremeditated exigencies of the moment of execution. In a Normal School the novice hears these subjects discussed by teachers and professors of learning and experience, and he is made acquainted with the general usage of the most successful members of the profession. He enters upon his important and responsible work, not only fortified with safeguards against mistake, but furnished with a kind of knowledge which reduces to a minimum his chances of failure, and increases to almost a certainty his chances of success.

ART. III.—*Indische Alterthumskunde von Christian Lassen*, Vol. III. Geschichte des Handels und des Griechisch-Römischen Wissens von Indien u. s. w. 8vo. pp. 1200.

THE peninsula of India is by its position isolated from the rest of Asia. The broad rivers and lofty mountain chains, almost defying transit, by which it is bounded, are formidable obstacles to intercourse. Capable of supporting a vast population, and blessed with exuberant fertility and abundant material resources, it seemed complete within itself; there was no necessity, and there seemed to be no inducement to open communication with the outside world. It has hence developed a civilization peculiar to itself, which has been wholly shaped by internal and domestic causes; and it has entered but little into the broad current of general history.

Still, remarkable as this seclusion is, it has at no time been total. It has both influenced other lands, and been influenced by them to an extent which will well repay examination. Its precious wares have stimulated trade from the earliest periods to the present. Its fertile and salubrious plains have attracted invaders in ancient and in modern times. Its grand natural features, its strange productions, coupled with its mysterious history, and its hoary wonders, have awakened curiosity, and led to investigations, from which science has received some of its most powerful impulses. It has given birth to a religion which has propagated itself over more than half of Asia. Its extensive literature and subtle philosophy have left their traces on the thought of the world from its fables and romances to the speculations of the schools and the doctrines of the church. Its astronomical and mathematical learning, caught from western lands, received a development greatly beyond anything that antiquity or the middle age could boast elsewhere. It gave the world the arithmetical digits: and had its methods of calculation and their results been sooner known, they would have formed an era in western science and materially accelerated its advance. Its language revolutionized philology, or rather brought it into being; for as now understood it cannot be said to have existed before.

Our present design is not to discuss the entire subject of the relations of India with the rest of the world, but simply to trace those which existed between India and ancient Greece and Rome, so far as they can now be recognized, and to exhibit the influence reciprocally exerted by these two great systems of civilization so widely sundered at once in locality and in character. And in treating of these relations, those which may be called aboriginal shall at present be excluded from consideration, and only those which in contrast may be denominated historical will be taken into account. It is foreign to our purpose to inquire into the primitive connection between the races, that from which the Greeks and Romans were descended on the one hand, and the Arian race that peopled India on the other. Recent investigations into their physical structure, their language, usages, truths, and religious ideas, have developed much that is interesting upon this point. Such a connection has not only been established in the clearest manner, but the measure of its intimacy ascertained, not only as contrasted with tribes and nations, sprung from an entirely different stock, but as compared with other affiliated branches of the same primeval race, and some definite conclusions reached as to the grade of culture in the great Arian family before its various members successively separated themselves from it; and the range of ideas, or fund of traditions, possessed by this aboriginal ancestry, and transmitted to the whole multitude of their descendants.

Dismissing this whole class of questions, attractive as they are, we shall confine our attention to relations established in historical times, and which admit of being historically traced, such as subsisted between them after the races had become distinct, and they had become established as separate nationalities. Thus viewed, our subject spontaneously divides itself into three great periods:

1. That of indirect relations, extending to the time of Alexander the Great.

2. That in which the relations were chiefly military and diplomatic, embracing the reigns of Alexander and his successors.

3. That of commercial intercourse, dating from the extension

of the Roman empire into the east, and particularly from B. C. 31, when Egypt became a Roman province.

Before entering upon this discussion, however, it may be proper in a few words to specify the authorities from which the following materials have been chiefly derived: They are Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde*, in four thick octavos, a work of immense learning, in which everything relating to the early history and antiquities of India is elaborately, and, as nearly as may be, exhaustively discussed; Weber's *Indische Skizzen*, which contains four brief but exceedingly interesting and valuable articles relating to ancient India; Ritter's *Erdkunde*, vol. iv., in which there is an extended inquiry into the knowledge possessed of India in ancient times; and Humboldt's *Cosmos*, in which a distinguished place is assigned to the expeditions of Alexander in the development of the idea of the Cosmos, or the enlargement of men's views respecting the world, as one grand, consistent, and organized whole.

Agreeably to the division suggested above, the first period of Greek acquaintance with India is that in which there was no direct intercourse between the two countries. The only knowledge which the Greeks possessed of India or its products, before the time of Alexander, was the vague and uncertain information which reached them through the medium of other nations, especially the Phenicians and the Persians. The Egyptians are not included in this statement, for the reason that there is no conclusive evidence of their having established at this early period immediate communication with India. The expedition of Sesostris is too indefinite and legendary to build much upon it. The similarity of their institutions can be otherwise accounted for. It has been said that cotton coloured with indigo, mummies wrapped in Indian muslins, and pieces of Chinese porcelain, have been found in tombs of the 18th dynasty, which came to an end, B. C. 1476. But this is declared by Lepsius to be a mistake; and even if such articles had been found, they would not establish the existence of a direct trade, as they might have been brought overland.

The Phenicians in the time of Solomon traded with Tarshish, a port of southern Spain in the West, and Ophir in the East. The learned have long been divided in opinion whether the

latter is to be sought in India, or Arabia, or upon the eastern coast of Africa. Weber and Lassen give their suffrages in favour of India, and assign the following reasons: 1. This best suits the conditions of the narrative, 1 Kings ix. 9, 26–28; x. 11, 12. 2 Chron. viii. 17, 18; ix. 21. The vessels were made at Ezion-geber and Elath, and must have sailed out by the Red Sea. The voyage was a long one, occupying three years. The articles obtained were gold, silver, precious stones, sandal-wood, called almug, or algum trees, ivory, apes and peacocks. 2. The names of some of these articles have been explained from the Sanscrit; thus *apes* קוֹף, *κήπος*, Sans. *kapi*, and with more or less probability *peacocks*, תֻּכִּיִּים, Sans. *çikhin; algum trees*, Sans. *valgum;* ivory שֶׁנְהַבִּים, lit. tooth of elephants, Sans. *ibha*, an elephant; whence also the Latin *ebur*, and in Greek, with the Arabic article prefixed, *ελ-εφας*, or *ελεφ-αντ*,* may be equivalent to *aleph-hind*, ox of India. In either case the name of the animal bears testimony that it was first heard of from India, and through the medium of a Semitic people. 3. Ophir has, with considerable probability, been identified with Abhîra, mentioned both by native and Greek writers, which was located at the mouths of the Indus, where it would be convenient of access to the Phenicians, and well situated for interior trade, to which gold could be readily brought from the north, and sandal-wood from the south. A volume of native tales, the Panchatantra, perhaps alluding to the good bargains which the sharp-witted Phenicians were able to make with these simple-minded people, says, "Where there are no men of understanding in the land sea-born jewels are of no value; herdmen in the land of Abhîra (Ophir) sell gems radiant as the moon for three cowries." 4. To this may be added at least the partial testimony of tradition. Josephus refers it to the Golden Chersonesus which belongs to India. The LXX have *Σουφιρ* and *Σωφιρ*, which is the Coptic name of India. The Arabic translator several times substitutes India for Ophir.

The trade with Ophir must have been very ancient. It was

* Tamarind is similarly derived from *tamar-hind*, palm of India. The Romans who first saw the elephant in the army of Pyrrhus called it *Bos lucanus*, ox of Lucania.

known to Moses, who introduces the name Gen. x. 29. In Job xxii. 24, comp. xxviii. 16, it is used as a synonym of gold, its most valuable commodity. Other Indian products bearing their native names are spoken of in the books of Moses, as bdellium and lign aloes; and in the Song of Solomon *spikenard* נֵרְדְּ and *saffron* or *crocus* כַּרְכֹּם.

Another interesting fact in this connection is that the written character of India is of Semitic origin. The possibility of this was doubtfully suggested by Kopp in 1821, who endeavoured to establish a resemblance in the case of five letters. The first effective steps in this direction, however, were taken by James Prinsep, of Calcutta, who, in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, for 1837 and 1838, first deciphered the letter upon the most ancient Sanscrit monuments. Subsequent monuments exhibit in regular series the successive changes by which it has been brought to its present form, and the several points of divergence of the various Asiatic alphabets which are based upon it. Prinsep's own conclusion was, "that the oldest Greek was nothing more than Sanscrit turned topsy-turvy." The conformity is so constant and so close as to demonstrate their common origin.

Now it is sufficiently plain that the Greeks did not derive their alphabet from India. Nor on the other hand could India have borrowed letters from Greece. For, 1. Alexander the Great found the art of writing in familiar use among the Hindoos. Strabo quotes Nearchos, one of the generals of Alexander, as saying that they wrote their letters on cotton cloth of close texture. The same thing is implied in what he says of their erecting mile-stones and guide-boards every ten stadia to indicate the distances and the turns of the road. Curtius also speaks of their writing on the inner bark of trees. 2. The oldest native monuments belong to the middle of the third century before Christ, and are therefore not long subsequent to the march of Alexander into the East. Upon these occurs the word meaning "to write," whose radical signification is not that of carving or engraving, but of anointing, and implies in its origin the use of a fluid ink. Inasmuch as there is no indication of letters having been coloured after they were carved in stone, this shows that writing was at that time not merely a

monumental art, but in current use on soft materials. The time when alphabetical writing was introduced into India cannot be accurately defined. It appears evident that the Vedas were at first unwritten, for the orthographic laws often require contractions which conflict with the metre. It has been made a question whether even the pratiçakhyasutras or Vedic grammars presuppose a written text.

However this may be, the only conclusion to which we can come is that the alphabets of Greece and of India must have been alike derived from a common source. And this can be no other than the Semitic; the additional sounds required in the Sanscrit being represented by varying the forms of already existing letters. The Phenicians or perhaps the Babylonians must have been their teachers.

From the Phenicians, who maintained an intercourse with India such as has now been described, the Greeks may doubtless at a very early period have become acquainted with some of the productions of India. But the name of the country was not known to them until they learned it from the Persians. Homer speaks of Ethiopians, or men of burnt countenances and dark skins, in both the extreme east and west. Those in the east have been conjectured to mean the Hindoos, as some things proper to them are by later writers attributed to Ethiopians, which might be explicable from this wide usage of the word. The *κασσίτερος* or *tin* of Homer is identical with the Sanscrit *kastîra*; though as tin was imported into India, and not exported from it, the word may have been carried thither in the Alexandrian period, as was probably the case likewise with the Sans. *kastûrî*, musk, from *καστόρειον*. Many of the fables attributed to Æsop and others are found again in the writings of India. The oldest which has been identified is in Archilochus in the eighth century before Christ. In the opinion of Lassen these were indigenous in India: but Weber, who was originally of the same mind, after further investigation satisfied himself that they were in the majority of instances borrowed from the Greek.

The first knowledge of India properly so called came, however, to the west through the Persians. They had the advantage of being a kindred people and their language was closely allied to the Sanscrit, particularly in its old Vedic form.

Scylax, a Greek in the employ of Darius Hystaspes, led an expedition to the Indus and sailed down it to the ocean, of all which he wrote an account which is now lost; a brief narrative of it is however preserved by Herodotus. The cuneiform inscriptions of Darius make mention of the Gadâra and Hidu, dwellers on the Indus, as tributary to him. They are also spoken of as having served in the armies of Xerxes against Greece, which is the first time that the two nations were brought in any way in actual contact. In the armies of Darius Codomanus, the antagonist of Alexander the Great, there were few Indian auxiliaries, so that the Persian rule in that region would seem to have been less extended or powerful than formerly. He is said to have had fifteen war elephants, which is the first appearance of this formidable animal in history. It is worth while to observe the precise accordance of the statements of the sacred writers with these facts recorded by profane historians. The Ahasuerus of the book of Esther, who is the same with Xerxes, is said (i. 1,) to have reigned from India to Ethiopia over one hundred and twenty-seven provinces. The Darius of the book of Daniel, who is the Cyaxares of Xenophon, had (vi. 1,) but one hundred and twenty provinces. The empire was not so large and had not yet been extended into India.

Herodotus, whose knowledge was derived directly or indirectly from the Persians, speaks of India as lying at the farthest limit of the habitable world, beyond which lay an unknown and impassable desert: it was occupied by many different nations speaking distinct languages. His theory that the extremes of the world possessed the noblest productions, was doubtless based on what he knew of the animal and vegetable wonders of India and of Africa. He speaks of the Indus as the only river known to him beside the Nile, which contained crocodiles, referring of course to the alligators; of the bamboo and its uses, of trees bearing a wool superior to that of sheep and used for clothing, which is the earliest mention of cotton; of an abundance of gold brought down by streams, or dug out by an enormous species of ants nearly as large as foxes and as fleet as horses. It is impossible to conjecture from what this story could have arisen, though it is repeated by subsequent writers, one of whom avers that he had seen their stuffed skins. He also speaks of the

Brahmanical hermits as killing no living thing, and subsisting entirely on the spontaneous products of the earth, having no dwellings, and when sick receiving no attention but dying in solitude.

The most complete account of India that was given to the Greeks during this period, however, was by Ctesias, who was taken prisoner by the Persians, and on account of his skill in medicine was retained for seventeen years as physician at the court of Alexander Mnemon. Among other works written by him after his return to Greece, B. C. 398, was a treatise on India, of which we now possess some scattered fragments, together with a very imperfect abstract by the Byzantine patriarch Photius, in the middle of the 9th century. It is impossible to acquit Ctesias altogether of the charge of exaggeration and the love of the marvellous. Although the fabulous stories, on the ground of which his truthfulness has been impeached, it is now well ascertained, were not inventions of his own, but fictions popularly credited in India, many of which are still found in native writings, and which he reported as he had heard them. Here belong the races of one-eyed men; of one-footed men, who could nevertheless run with incredible swiftness; of men with ears reaching to their elbows, which they used as cloaks; of pigmies three feet high, with domestic animals to match; of macrobians who lived four hundred years, which is very moderate, for Indian writings attribute to them an age of from one to ten thousand years; of water in which nothing could swim, the same doubtless that was fabled to convert everything it touched to stone. It is not perhaps strange that he should have believed that elephants were used in war to pull down fortified walls, when he had seen them tear up palm trees by the roots; or that the reports of India's tropical heat should have been magnified into the statement that the sun appeared there to be ten times as large as in other lands, and that the surface of the sea was so hot that fish could not approach it. These exaggerations and fables were mingled with sober and reliable accounts of the country, its population, and productions. He described India as it was known and conceived by the Persians. One remarkable statement, which seems to imply some knowledge of electrical laws and the power of

metals as conductors, is that he had seen iron swords which had the property of dispelling clouds and lightning.

The era of direct intercourse between Greece and India was opened by the march of Alexander into the East. He entered the country in the spring of 327, and in the course of a year subdued a large portion of the Panjâb. Those native princes who submitted to his sway, he left undisturbed in their dominions and even enlarged their boundaries; while all who offered opposition were severely chastised. Cities were founded and garrisons stationed at important points with a view both to secure his conquests and to facilitate trade. His desire to extend his march to the Ganges was frustrated by the unwillingness of his troops to proceed farther. He consequently built a fleet of boats and sailed down the Indus to its mouth, whence Nearchos conducted the transports homeward by sea, while Alexander with the rest of the troops marched overland to Persia and Babylon, where he died June 11th, B. C. 323.

The political consequences of this conquest were neither deep nor lasting. The Indian provinces being left under their native governors were but loosely attached to the Macedonian empire. And even this shadow of Greek authority was resisted and thrown off by Sandrocottus or Chandragupta. Friendly relations were established between this prince and Seleucus Nicator, which continued through successive reigns, signalized and cemented by the exchange of ambassadors between the courts of Babylon and Palibothra. About B. C. 256, the satrap of Bactria revolted from the Seleucidæ and founded an independent line of Greco-Bactrian kings, whose sway was extended beyond the Indus and as far as Guzerat. This kingdom was subsequently divided and one part overturned by the Parthians; but the eastern or Indian portion continued to maintain itself until about B. C. 85, when it was swallowed up by the advance of the Indo-Scythians. The last relic of Greek government in India thus disappeared about 240 years after its sudden and brilliant beginning.

The indirect results of this conquest were more important. Its effect on the Greek mind was prodigious. Humboldt remarks that the march of Alexander deserves to be entitled a scientific expedition. The boundaries of the known world

received a vast enlargement. The Greeks were led over immense regions hitherto untravelled. They beheld nature in forms never before witnessed, the mighty Himalayas, the broad Indus, a new world of vegetation and of animal life. They were introduced to a civilization totally unlike their own, whose compact forms and hoary antiquity commanded their respect, while it stimulated their curiosity. Particularly the rigour of the ascetics, their strange manner of life, and their contempt of the world and of death kindled their reverence and put an end to the disdain with which they had hitherto looked down upon all barbarians.

Several of the generals of Alexander published such notes as they had made, upon their return. The range of their observation was, however, limited to the line of march. The brevity of their stay prevented any extended and careful investigations, even if these had comported with their soldierly tastes. And the portion of the country through which they passed was the least strict in its observance of the peculiar Brahmanical regulations. By far the most valuable treatise on India belonging to this period was from the pen of Megasthenes, who in the quality of ambassador at the court of Chandragupta had an opportunity of studying not only natural features and productions, but the interior life of the people, their castes, government, religion, manners, and history. Only fragments now remain of any of these works, although enough to give some indication of their character and to make us regret their loss.

This extended knowledge gave a new impetus to science. A multitude of facts was accumulated bearing on natural history. Geography was freed from the crude and fabulous notions previously entertained, and correct conceptions gained of the form and structure of the earth. How utterly vague and erroneous were the opinions which prevailed before, will appear from the fact that Alexander thought he might find the sources of the Nile in India.

The march of Alexander likewise left its impress in the region of Greek mythology and fiction. The worship of Bacchus appears to have begun in Thrace, and he received the name of Dionysos, or the god of Nysa, from a mountain of that name in that region. But as the Greeks extended their know-

ledge of foreign lands new Nysas were discovered or imagined and associated with this favourite deity, and the story of his victorious marches was more and more enlarged. Herodotus heard of a Nysa in Egypt. Euripides speaks of his having marched as far as Bactria. The companions of Alexander found a Nysa on their route, and were ever on the alert for evidences of Greek heroes preceding them. Discovering a people who clothed themselves in skins and branded their oxen and mules with the sign of a club, they set them down as descendants of Hercules. Another people, addicted to the culture of the vine, and whose kings indulged in festive processions with drums and cymbals, were supposed to have sprung from Dionysos. A sacred cave, near which they passed, was assumed to be the identical one in which Prometheus had been bound and from which Hercules had rescued him.

But Megasthenes gave a wider extension and more stability to these legends by interweaving them with the history of India. The only departure from native traditions, with which he appears to have been chargeable, arose from his prepossessions on this subject. He arbitrarily identified Hercules with the hero Krishna, in whom Vishnu the club-bearer became incarnate, though without materially altering the Indian legends respecting him. He seems to have found Dionysos in Siva, but what he says of him was chiefly an invention of his own, and grew out of the theory which he had brought with him from Greece of the progress of civilization and the primitive condition of mankind. And it may be added, that he is not the only writer who has undertaken to reconstruct history upon the basis of his own subjective theory.

In opposition to the Hindoo tradition that the most ancient condition of the race was the most perfect, and that all the affairs of state and of civil life were divinely regulated at the beginning, he represents the earliest inhabitants of the country as nomads, clothed in skins and subsisting on the spontaneous productions of the ground. But Dionysos, leading a host of Pans, Satyrs, and women, marched with drums and cymbals from one end of India to the other, subduing the entire land and teaching the people to plow and cultivate the soil, to worship the gods with processions and dances, and to practise the

arts of civilized life. He at length left India under the government of Spatemhas, or Svayambhuva, the Self-Existent, who was succeeded by his son Buddha, and so on from father to son in regular succession since.

This myth reached its final form in the Dionysiacs of Nonnos from Panopolis in Upper Egypt, an enormous epic still extant in 48 books. The part which relates to India seems to have no basis whatever in any native authorities, certainly not in the Mahabharata or Ramayana from which some have supposed it to be partly drawn. Many of the names of nations and rivers are fictitious, and those of cities and generals are derived from Greek. It is a confused medley of Greek and Asiatic legends transferred to new localities, and of adventures modelled after the experiences of Alexander in this region.

The exploits of Alexander also gave rise to numerous legends which spread throughout the east and have been perpetuated to the present day. Lassen remarks, "It has been the singular fortune of this most gifted monarch of antiquity to have his deeds sung by none but mediocre poets in his own country and in his native tongue, while among orientals and even occidentals whose ancestors stood in no relation to him, he has been celebrated in poems of high repute. In the west he was scarcely less renowned than Charlemagne and King Arthur. He has been, as it were, naturalized among the modern Persians, and incorporated in the history of their heroes by Nizâmi, one of their most distinguished poets in the best period of their literature. No less than ten Persian poets have employed themselves upon these legends. Finally, a story of his life stuffed with fables is a popular book and extensively read among the modern Greeks."

The accounts of India, which we owe to those who visited that country in the train of Alexander, or as ambassadors from the court of his successors, are interesting to us not only as revealing the new impulses communicated to the Greek mind from this remote quarter, but as exhibiting the conception formed of India and Indian institutions by the most cultivated nation of antiquity. They are further valuable in supplementing the knowledge we have of the country and its antiquities, and in supplying chasms in our other sources of information.

One most important service rendered by them in this respect is, that they furnish us a fixed point, which we have no other means of attaining, in Indian chronology, and which is available at once in its history, its language and its literature. We are made acquainted through Greek sources with a number of names of native princes. Many of these do not reappear in any domestic history which has yet been examined. Others are simply the names of nations or countries transferred to their rulers, or they are descriptive titles or epithets, or as in the case of Poros, the most formidable antagonist of Alexander, they are not individual but family names, and can no more be made available for the purpose of identification than Pharaoh or Ptolemy in Egypt, or Cæsar in Rome. But the leader of the revolt shortly after the death of Alexander, presents us with a name that is free from these objections. The Sandracottus of the Greeks is unquestionably the Chandragupta of native authorities. This gives us a fixed point from which all the others can be determined.

Still further, Chandragupta's grandson Açoka was the first king who interested himself specially in the spread of Buddhism within his own dominions and in foreign parts. Several inscriptions graven by him on pillars or hewn in the solid rock, have been discovered in various parts of the peninsula, at Delhi, Allahabad, Guzerat, in Orissa, in the vicinity of Peshâwar and in other places. They are in three different dialects, and contain edicts of substantially the same tenor, exhorting to mutual forbearance and toleration, and to planting trees, digging wells, erecting houses of entertainment and rest for travellers, and doing other things which would be for the public advantage; and they are enforced by the rewards attendant upon such meritorious deeds in this world and in the next. Their date is fixed with certainty by their containing the names of Antiochus, Ptolemy, Antigonus and Alexander. The language in which they are composed shows that the popular dialects were then already forming, from which the various local languages of India have since sprung. Data are here afforded for determining the extent to which this had then proceeded, and consequently of inferring the date of writings in which a corresponding state of the language may be observed.

The Greek rhetorician Dion Chrysostomus says that the poems of Homer were sung by the Indians in their own language, and that the sorrows of Priam, the lamentations of Andromache and Hecabe, and the valour of Achilles and Hector, were well known to them. As this is certainly not true in its literal sense, it can have no other meaning than that poems similar to those of Homer were in circulation. Now the Mahabharata, one of the great Indian epics, does contain passages which bear a general resemblance to those already referred to. It has been plausibly conjectured that this statement of Dion was derived from Megasthenes, who had a more intimate knowledge of Indian affairs than any other writer of antiquity and from whom alone such information could be expected. If this be so, it seems to make it clear that this great Indian epic was then already in existence. And at least a negative conclusion can be reached, regarding the time of the events which it celebrates, from another statement of Megasthenes, that Hercules lived 6,240 years before Chandragupta. Now as according to his belief Hercules was Krishna, whose deeds enter into the theme of this poem, it follows that the great war which it describes was at that time referred to a remote antiquity and could not have occurred, as some have conjectured, but a century before.

The effect upon India of these two centuries of contact was less considerable than that which we have seen to be exerted upon the Greeks. The reasons for this are obvious. The number of native Greeks settled in the country was inconsiderable, a large proportion of the garrisons being mercenaries from various Asiatic nations. Again, they scarcely penetrated into India proper, since they held merely Cabulistan and the Panjâb, districts which were regarded very much as Galilee was by the Jews, and for a similar reason. They were despised on account of their assimilation to foreign manners, and whatever was found in that quarter was hence regarded with suspicion. And further, the exclusive system of caste and a rigorous code of laws and observances laid great restrictions on influences coming from abroad.

Nevertheless such an influence can be traced to some extent. There are several passages in the native writings in which Greeks are spoken of or alluded to. A few words were introduced into

Sanscrit from the Greek, as *thatega* for *στραττηγός*, *dramma* for *δραχμή*, as at a later period dînâri for the Latin denarius. The art of coining money was first learned from the Greeks, and was subsequently maintained in slavish imitation of the models they had furnished. Wilson thinks that the Hindu drama is independent of the Greek; but Weber is of the opinion that the former may not improbably have originated in imitation of the Greek scenic exhibitions, since the oldest of them are later than this period of which we are now treating, and belong for the most part to Ozene in the west of the country, the part consequently which was most liable to be affected by Greek manners, and the stage-curtain is called *Yavanikâ*, i. e. Grecian.

The influence of Greek architecture is traceable in the northwest of India. The Hindus also derived from the Greeks their knowledge of the seven planets, the first allusion to which is found in seven points on the coins of the Indian satraps in Guzerat. Their employment to designate the days of the week, which was original in Egypt, and spread thence to other lands, belongs to the next period, a different division of time based on the light and the dark half of the month having prevailed previously.

This brings us to the third and last division of our subject, the period of commercial intercourse under the Roman empire. This trade was carried on over various routes. The least considerable portion coasted along the Persian Gulf, passed up the Euphrates and so overland to the Mediterranean. But as the mouth of the Euphrates was held by the hostile Parthians, the principal overland traffic was forced to pursue a more circuitous route farther to the east and north. The point of departure was Minnegara, the modern Ahmedpur on the Indus; thence it followed the great road still frequented through Cabulistan into Bactria. Here three roads diverged. One led across the Belurtag mountains to Central Asia, East Turkistan, the desert of Gobi, and Thibet, and was the avenue of trade with the seres inhabiting this region. A second took the direction of Herat and the Parthian capital, Hecatanpylon, thence to Ecbatana in Media and through the passes of Mount Zagros to Kalah on the Tigris, and into Asia Minor. The third passed down the Oxus to the Caspian Sea, where the goods were shipped across and

then forwarded to the Black Sea, and so brought down to the Mediterranean.

The disastrous defeat of Crassus by the Parthians, B. C. 53, and the frequent hostilities that followed in that quarter, greatly obstructed, if they did not absolutely prevent all traffic by way of the Euphrates. The route by the Oxus and the Caspian had been open since the death of Mithridates the Great, B. C. 63, but it was tedious and difficult. The reduction of Egypt to the condition of a Roman province, B. C. 30, opened the most direct as well as the most practicable route of all, viz., that by the Red Sea; the advantages of which were much increased by Hippalus' discovery of the S. W. monsoon. Alexandria now at length justified the expectations of its illustrious founder and speedily rose to great consequence, as the centre or entrepot of a trade which was constantly growing with the increasing wealth and luxury of Rome.

According to Strabo one hundred and twenty ships were engaged in the trade with India and the number was subsequently greatly increased. They left Egypt commonly about the middle of July. Thirty days brought them to the ports at the mouth of the Red Sea, whence they sailed in three different directions to Pattalene at the mouth of the Indus, to Barygaza on the Gulf of Cambay, which had the most considerable trade of all the Indian cities, or to Muziris, and other emporia in the southern part of the peninsula. In the latter half of December or the first of January, they set out on their return from the Malabar coast, that they might take advantage of the N. E. monsoon, thus completing their circuit within the year. Cohorts of archers accompanied them for their protection against the pirates which infested those seas.

Pliny states that the annual sum expended in the trade to India was never less than fifty million sesterces, or about two million dollars, and the wares thence obtained were valued at one hundred times that amount. The articles imported by the Romans were Indian iron, which was prized as of a superior quality, and a great variety of precious stones, including the diamond, the art of reducing which to dust for the purposes of the lapidary, Pliny thought to be one of the most wonderful results achieved by human ingenuity. The opal and pearl (*mar-*

garita,) betray their Indian origin by their Sanscrit names. To the above are to be added ebony, teak-wood, a species of oil, rice, sugar, several kinds of drugs, spices, as cloves, cinnamon, cassia, ginger, and pepper; the two last are Sanscrit names, pepper, also being entitled yavana-priya, *dear to the Greeks*, where Greek is used with the same latitude that Frank now is in the Levant; also colours, as indigo, a name which points to India, lac, and the vegetable cinnabar; perfumes, as myrrh, spikenard and aloe wood, ivory, tortoise shell, wool, seric skins, so called because obtained from Central Asia, though the species of animal is unknown, the celebrated myrrhine vases, the material of which was so costly that a piece only large enough to make three cups of a pint each, cost from $1500 to $3000. Lions, leopards, and panthers were brought for the circus, but not elephants, which were obtained from Mauritania. Roses also were imported for garlands and bouquets. And last, though not least in this enumeration of commodities, are cotton and silk.

The ambiguity of the terms employed by classic writers often makes it doubtful whether they are referring specifically to cotton, or to some other similar material. It can scarcely be questioned, however, that cotton garments, are intended by Herodotus, when he speaks of the Persians, as wearing σινδονες, a word which some derive from Sindh or the Indus, and others refer to a Semitic origin. The book of Esther (i. 6,) in describing the rich tapestry in the palace of the Persian monarch Ahasuerus or Xerxes, makes use of the Indian name כַּרְפַּס, which was subsequently borrowed by the Greeks and Romans. The cotton plant is spoken of on two small islands in the Persian Gulf; but it is doubtful whether it was cultivated in Upper Egypt as early as the time of Pliny. So that beyond question India was at that period the chief source of supply to the Roman world.

Seres and Serica, whence silk was brought, are not proper names of the people and the country, but designations given to them from their staple article of merchandise. They mean strictly silk-men and the silk-region, the words being traced back to *sir*, in Mongolian and the language of Corea, or with the final *r* omitted in Chinese, *sse* or *szu*, a silk-worm. The culture of silk was first introduced into the Byzantine empire

by Justinian in the fifth century, prior to which time India was the principal mart of the silk trade; the overland route to Central Asia being obstructed by frequent wars. From Aristotle it appears that he had no accurate knowledge of the silk-worm, and that few women at that time used silk, although cocoons (the word is Sanscrit) were even then brought to Greece. Under the Roman emperors the use of silk largely increased, although the knowledge of its origin did not keep pace with the employment of the material, for Virgil and Pliny both speak of it as combed from the leaves of trees. A pound of silk in the reign of Aurelian sold for a pound of gold.

The Roman merchants took to India in exchange for the wares thence obtained, copper, lead, tin, silver ware; coral, which is said to have been prized by the Hindus as pearls were by the Romans; stibium, which seems to have been preferred to the native articles employed from very early times in painting the eyelids; a few gems, incense, the edible Egyptian lotus, garments, girdles, and wine, notwithstanding the fact that all intoxicating drinks were forbidden by Hindu law. Their purchases, however, were chiefly paid for in gold and silver. Hence immense quantities of coin were annually carried into India, great numbers of which have been discovered in the most widely separated parts of that vast peninsula, in Cabulistan, the Mahratta territory, the Deccan, and Ceylon. These are of various ages, and by their varying numbers afford a ready indication of the times in which trade flourished most. Coins of the Roman republic have been found, but these must have been brought to India at a later time. Those of the Emperor Augustus and onward to the Antonines are most abundant, showing that the most flourishing period of this trade was from the beginning of the Christian era to the end of the second century. That the commerce continued to be prosecuted after the division of the Roman empire appears from the coins of Theodosios I., Marcianos, and Leon, discovered in Malabar.

The vast commercial enterprises of this period led to great frequency of intercourse. The Roman merchants gradually extended their trips farther and farther, not only to Ceylon, but along the eastern side of Hindostan. By Pliny's time they

must have reached the mouth of the Ganges, for he gives the measurement in Roman miles to that point from Perimula on the island of Manaar, near the northern extremity of Ceylon. And yet, although wonderfully well acquainted with the productions of Hindostan proper, he shows no knowledge of Farther India. The geographer Ptolemy, however, not only states the distance to the Ganges, but beyond it to Malacca or the Golden Chersonesus, and thence even to Kattigara or Canton: and mentions the name of Alexandros, who had reached that remote point. Instances are also given of those who had penetrated Serica to its capital. And a very interesting experience is recorded of Jambulus, son of a merchant, and himself a merchant, who paid a reluctant visit to the Indian Archipelago. While on a trading excursion through Arabia he was seized by robbers and carried with his companions to Ethiopia. He was there, with a single companion, put in an open boat provisioned for six months and sent to sea with directions to sail southward; the idea being that if they reached land in safety, Ethiopia would enjoy six hundred years of peace and prosperity, but if they put back or were driven back, they were subjected to the most frightful tortures, because of the calamities this would be sure to bring upon the country. After four months tossing about upon the sea, they reached the shore of an island where they remained seven years, at the termination of which they were sent to sea again and finally driven on the coast of India, whence he returned home and published an account of his travels. From his description of the island, its productions, among which was the sago-palm, and its inhabitants, who were divided into castes like the Hindus, and were governed by similar laws, it is plain that it was Bali, which, like the neighbouring Java and Madura, was at a very early period colonized from India. He speaks of their possessing an alphabet of twenty-eight letters divided into seven classes, which is substantially the Sanscrit alphabet, adapted perhaps to the peculiar sounds of the native language.

The frequency with which Hindostan was visited by traders from the west is farther shown by the copious lists of cities which Ptolemy was able to give. He reports fewer from Farther India for a double reason, both because being less civilized

it did not contain so many cities, and because being more rarely visited, these were less known. Another fact still more conclusive, is that several cities in both the Indian peninsulas and in Taprobane or Ceylon, bore Greek appellations, either originally imposed, or translations of the native names. These must have been factories, or places where considerable bodies of foreigners stationed themselves with more or less permanence for purposes of trade.

In this trade the Indian merchants also took an active part. That portion of it which extended beyond Hindostan to Farther India, the Indian Archipelago, and Canton, was almost exclusively conducted by them. They also participated in the trade to the westward. Settlements of Indian traders are known to have existed on the coasts of Arabia and Ethiopia, and on the island of Socotra or Dioscorides, whose name is perhaps Sanscrit. Many of them established themselves in Egypt, and they were emulous of a share of the trade between Alexandria and Western ports. They are particularly spoken of as visiting Lacedemonia.

Cornelius Nepos relates an incident, which can hardly be explained on any other hypothesis than their vigorous participation in the overland trade likewise. He says that when Metellus Celer was proconsul of Gaul, B. C. 60, some Indians were sent to him by the king of the Suevi, who had been engaged in trade but had been driven by storms and adverse winds completely out of their course. Now unless we suppose that they had entirely circumnavigated the continent of Africa, the only other alternative would seem to be that they were pursuing their avocation upon the route across the Caspian and Black Seas, and were driven by stress of weather to the northern shores of the latter, where they fell into the hands of the Suevi and were dealt with in the manner already mentioned.

The competition among the native princes for the trade with Rome, and their desire to obtain a full share of its benefits, may also be inferred from the repeated embassies sent from India to the Roman emperors, doubtless with this view. Thus we read of one from a king by the name of Poros, to the emperor Augustus; another from a king in Ceylon to Claudius;

a third from a king on the Malabar coast to Antoninus Pius, and a fourth was sent to the emperor Julian.

The effects of this increased intercourse upon the west, on one hand, and upon India on the other, are yet to be considered. No assimilation of Rome and India is to be expected. They were too remote, and too unlike, and the proportion of actual traders to the entire population of either country was too small for us to look for such a result.

It may be said, however, to have accelerated the fall of Rome, by tending to increase and pamper its luxury, by enormously enriching one class, the merchants, at the expense of the rest, and by the prodigious drain of the precious metals which, as has already been stated, it occasioned.

Its intellectual results were, however, of greater importance than its political consequences. The mind of the west received a powerful impulse on the one hand, from the vast additions now made to the knowledge previously possessed of the world and of natural phenomena, and on the other, from contact with the strange and striking forms of Hindoo thought and life. The personal observations of Alexander's generals, or the notes of subsequent merchants and travellers, furnished the data by which Eratosthenes, Hipparchus, Strabo, and Ptolemy, not only reached surprisingly accurate conclusions respecting these hitherto unvisited lands, but were greatly aided in working out the problem of the form and dimensions of the habitable earth and of the globe itself. They furnished the data likewise from which Pliny drew largely in composing his Natural History, that encyclopedia, as it has been well called, of the knowledge of the ancients. And even the errors, into which the ancient geographers were betrayed by these authorities, had an important connection with the greatest discovery of modern times. The imperfections in the mode of reckoning distance in marches and voyages made it impossible for the most careful to attain strict accuracy. But the itineraries, which were then the principal sources of information, did not even aim at the precision demanded by science. When the distance was extended to hundreds or thousands of miles, the margin of possible error became necessarily very great. In latitude, these errors were capable of at least partial correction by the statements made

respecting climate and productions, or the length of the longest day, or the direction of the shadow at noon, or the proportion between the shadow on the dial-plate, and the gnomon by which it was cast, whence the polar altitude might be readily calculated. But in computing the longitude no correction of this sort was possible for even the gravest errors, and the more remote the place the more considerable the error becomes. Thus Ptolemy gives the latitude of Cabul within 24 minutes of the truth, but the longitude which he assigns to it is 28 degrees in excess. At Madura the error of longitude is 30 degrees, and at Canton 46. The limit of the eastern continent was thus conceived to lie far beyond its actual position, and the task which Columbus proposed to accomplish by his western voyage was to that extent reduced.

Some of the doctrines of the Gnostics and the Neoplatonists were plainly borrowed from or modified by those of the Indian philosophy. This influence is apparent in the philosophical tenets of Plotinus, and Porphyry, as well as in the Gnostic ideas of emanation and the demiurgos, of the evil inherent in matter, the virtue of asceticism, obtaining direct communion with God by the mortification of the senses and profound meditation, and thus attaining to miraculous powers, the division of men into the three classes of *πνευματικοι*, *ψυχικοι* and *ὑλικοι*, etc.; while monachism, celibacy, the veneration of relics, bells, rosaries, the tonsure, and the like, betray a Buddhist origin.

On the other hand, the Hindus learned their astronomy from the west, and seem to have been subjected to some influences from the Christian church. Some peculiarities were introduced into the worship of Krishna, and some modifications made of the conceptions previously entertained of him, which seem to have been derived from the worship of Christ. There are also some strange approximations to the ideas of a personal supreme God, and the sovereign efficacy of faith in him, which seem as if they must have been borrowed from a Christian source.

ART. IV.—*An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy: Being a Defence of Fundamental Truth.* By JAMES McCOSH, LL.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1866.

DR. McCOSH has established a high rank for himself as a judicious, sound, and able writer on metaphysics and cognate questions relative to "fundamental truth." The freedom, sometimes amounting to diffuseness, of his style increases the popularity and influence of his philosophical writings. He seldom fails to detect the real issue between truth and error, and to do good service on the side of the former. Beyond any other considerable living author he has seized upon and exposed the false and dangerous theories propounded by the different philosophers and schools which exercise the greatest power over modern thought, and are working the direst havoc among the young thinkers of Europe and America. His great mission is, indeed, the "defence of fundamental truth" against assaults of sceptics, destructives, and the unintentional betrayals of mistaken friends. And nobly does he fulfil it. He shows that judicial mind in regard to philosophical questions which preserves its balance between contending parties, and rarely fails to seize and maintain the truth, sifting it clear of intermingled fallacies and sophisms. Among all the philosophical writers of the present time, none lays so firmly the foundations which underlie all truth, natural and revealed, and without which, all belief in substance, cause, or reality of any sort, must totter and fall.

It was therefore eminently fit that Dr. McCosh should bring to the test of a rigid examination the principles so industriously and ably propagated by one of the mightiest of modern destructive writers, John Stuart Mill. Such a work greatly needed to be done, and our author was the man to do it. This volume is important, not merely in reference to the views of Mr. Mill, but of the whole school of writers, past and present, British and continental, he so ably represents. Not only so. Mr. Mill's most significant and recent exposition of his views is presented in his review of Sir William Hamilton's Metaphysics. Thus Dr. McCosh in reviewing the former, continually deals

with the doctrines of the latter, the strongest representative of the contrary side, not to say extreme, in philosophy, which the century has produced in Britain. A searching examination of Mill's philosophical discussions becomes therefore really a survey of the two great currents of philosophical opinion in that country and our own at the present time. We invite the attention of our readers to a few of the salient points of our author's latest work.

1. The grand feature of Mill's system appears in his doctrine of sensations. To these he reduces all the operations of mind, and of course all that we know of mind or matter, or being. He says, "a feeling and a state of consciousness are, in the language of philosophy, equivalent expressions; everything is a feeling of which the mind is conscious; everything which it *feels*, or, in other words, which form a part of its own sentient existence." "Feeling, in the proper sense of the term, is a genus of which Sensation, Emotion, and Thought, are the subordinate species." The mind he analyzes into a mere "thread of consciousness," a "series of feelings which is conscious of itself as past and future." He says, "the belief I entertain that my mind exists, when it is not feeling, nor thinking, nor conscious of its own existence, resolves itself into a belief of a Permanent Possibility of these states." But these states or exercises have already, as we have seen, been resolved into feelings or sensations. In endless forms he teaches us that "matter may be defined a permanent possibility of sensations." Matter, mind, and all exercises of mind, in short, the universe, the *omne scibile*, are therefore resolved into sensations and possibilities of sensation. This is the only residuum of reality left to us by the alembic of Mr. Mill's philosophy. It involves the identity of Mind and Matter, and becomes indifferently Sensationalism, Materialism, Idealism, Nihilism, according to the standpoint from which it is viewed.

Thus, if we view sensation as an exercise or modification of mind, then all things are mere mental modifications or possibilities thereof. This is Idealism, or mere Egoism, or Infinite Subjectivity. But if sensation be an affection of matter, then all things are reducible to affections of matter or possibilities thereof, and Materialism ensues. And whether sensation be an

affection of mind or matter, in either case, it is the affection of a mere "possibility of sensation." To such heights of airy nothing does this pretentious philosophy soar. To such abysmal depths of utter Nihilism does it plunge. We look for substance and are mocked with shadows. This "new analytic" of ontology yields, for its grand climacteric, sensations as the sum and essence of all being.

But how does this prince of destructives account for other conscious exercises of consciousness besides mere sensation? What of Perception, Memory, Abstraction, Judgment, Reasoning, Imagination, Supersensual Intuition? Mr. Mill would analyze all these as well as the objects known by them into sensations, from which, by the aid of the principles of association, he would derive them. But how does he transform a sensation into what is wholly of another kind, into a remembrance, a judgment, a reasoning? How, in short, does he make it what it is not? *Ex nihilo nil fit.* Out of sensations, by no mode of derivation or combination, can aught but sensation be made. The attempt of the sensational, or as they prefer to call themselves, the psychological school, to construct all intellectual acts or cognitions, yea all being itself, out of sensations, is of a piece with the famous recipe for making stone-broth, viz., by putting with the stone the needed condiments of meats and vegetables. Dr. McCosh very aptly says:

"The main elements which he employs are sensations and associations of sensation. But he works up sensations of mind and body, of space and time, of personality and personal identity, of infinity and obligation to do good, which are not contained in the nature of sensations, and which could be imparted to them only by a new power superinduced, which power would require to have a place allotted to it in his system, and its laws enunciated, and its significance estimated. Again, it will be shown that Mr. Mill has made an unwarrantable use and application of the laws of association. These are the laws of the succession of our ideas, and nothing more. Give us two ideas, and place these two ideas together in the mind, and association will tend to bring them up once more in union. But it is not the office of association to give us the ideas, which must first be furnished to it. We shall see that Mr. Mill is for ever giving

to association a power which does not belong to it, of generating new ideas by an operation in which we see sensations go in, and a lofty idea coming out, solely by the idea being surreptitiously introduced, without any person being expected to notice it. The process carried on by this whole school of analysts is like that of the alchemists, who, when they put earth into the retort, never could get anything but earth, and could get gold only by introducing some substance containing gold. The philosopher's stone of this modern psychology is of the same character as that employed in mediæval physics. If we put in only sensations, as some do, we have never anything but sensations; and a 'dirt philosophy,' as it has been called, is the product. If we get gold, (as certainly Mr. Mill does at times), it is because it has been quietly introduced by the person who triumphantly exhibits it." P. 53.

Mr. Mill, however, attempts to summon to his relief the great Kantian doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, which so subserves the cause of destructives, nihilists, and sceptics, whether materialistic or idealistic. The adoption of this and some affiliated principles from the subjective theories of Kant, by Hamilton and his followers, comes near neutralizing all the force of his incomparable defences of the realism of Reid—*i. e.*, of a real external world, a valid perception of external objects, a real dualism of mind and matter, soul and body. Hamilton's most eminent disciple, Mansel, has pushed this principle to results, in his *Limits of Religious Thought*, which are most portentous and annihilating, and undermine, in the very effort to confirm, the foundations of all faith or belief. The doctrine that all knowledge is relative to our knowing faculties is, within proper limits, obviously true and safe. It is true that we know nothing which is not so related to our knowing faculties as to be capable of cognition by them. It is also true that many properties of knowable objects, are not so related to our finite faculties, in their present state, as to be capable of being known by them. So far it is admitted that all knowledge is relative, but relative in such a sense as to be a true and trustworthy knowledge. But these writers, Kant, Hamilton, and at the opposite pole, Mill and the sceptical sensationalists, hold it to be relative in such a sense as to destroy

the purity and genuineness of our knowledge. They say, we do not know how much of what we discern in any object of cognition is contributed by the object cognized, and how much by the mind cognizing—*i. e.*, we know nothing at all about it. The case is thus briefly put by our author.

"Sir William (Hamilton) gives a third reason (of the relativity of knowledge), and here the error appears. '3d. Because the modes thus relative to our faculties, are presented to and known by the mind only, under modifications determined by these faculties themselves.' This doctrine is thoroughly Kantian in itself and in its logical consequences. It makes the mind look at things, but through a glass so cut and coloured that it gives a special shape and hue to every object. "Suppose (says Hamilton) that the total object of consciousness in perception is=12; and suppose that the external reality contributes 6, the material sense 3, and the mind 3—this may enable you to form some rude conjecture of the nature of the object of perception." (*Metaph.* ii. p. 129.) This doctrine very much neutralizes that of natural realism, which Hamilton seems, after the manner of Reid, to be so strenuously defending. To suppose that in perception or cognition proper, we mix elements derived from our subjective stores, is to unsettle our whole convictions as to the reality of things; for if the mind adds three things, why not thirty things, why not three hundred, till we are landed in absolute idealism, or in the dreary flat into which those who could float in that empty space are sure in the end to fall, that is, absolute scepticism.

"By assuming this middle place between Reid and Kant, this last of the great Scottish metaphysicians has been exposed to the fire of the opposing camps of idealism and realism, and it will be impossible for the school to continue to hold the position of their master." Pp. 234—5.

The adamantine logic with which Hamilton has maintained a valid perception by the human mind of a real external world, will stand before such contradictories of it, if admitted to be legitimate, about as long as wooden ships before iron rams. One of these two contradictions in his system must displace the other. Of course, it is only fair in such destructive writers as Mill and Spencer, to use the weapons he forges for them in assail-

ing the really great and valuable defences he has elaborated in defence of fundamental truth.

One way in which these writers try to construct the whole universe of knowable things out of sensations and possibilities thereof, by association, is through the alleged relative character, or the relations, of these sensations. But the simple answer to all this is, that sensations can only yield sensations. If there be a knowledge of relations which is something more than these, such as causality, substance, likeness, difference, infinitude, then these involve new objects, elements, sources of knowledge beyond mere sensation. What this school makes the product of mere sensation is furtively interpolated from a higher source. It is the philosopher's stone turning sand into gold, when the gold is previously and otherwise furnished to it. Sensations will give us body, spirit, cause, substance, if these are only supplied from the higher faculties of the soul. As Dr. McCosh abundantly and ably shows all knowledge of relations supposes a previous knowledge of the things related.

This spurious doctrine of the relativity of knowledge is carried to its legitimate consequences by Grote in his exposition of Plato's philosophy, (art. *Thexetetus.*) As quoted by our author, p. 245, he uses the following language, which clearly obliterates all intrinsic distinction between truth and error, making that alone true or false, which is so in the view of each individual.

"Object is implicated with, limited or measured by, Subject, a doctrine proclaiming the relativeness of all objects, perceived, conceived, known or felt, and the omnipresent involution of the perceiving, conceiving, knowing, or feeling, subject: the object varying with the subject. 'As things appear to me, so they are to me; as they appear to you, so they are to you.' This theory is just and important, if rightly understood and explained." "So far as the doctrine asserts essential fusion and implication between subject and object, with actual multiplicity of distinct subjects—denying the reality either of absolute and separate subject, or of absolute and separate object—I think it true and instructive." "What is truth to one man, is not truth, and is often falsehood, to another; that which governs the mind as infallible authority in one part of the globe, is

treated with indifference or contempt elsewhere. Each man's belief, though in part determined by the same causes as the belief of others, is in part also determined by causes peculiar to himself. When a man speaks of truth, he means what he himself (along with others, or singly, as the case may be) believes to be truth; unless he expressly superadds the indication of some other persons believing in it."

This destroys all objective truth and standards of truth—all foundations. If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?

Dr. McCosh thus very felicitously exhibits Mill as being in different aspects, at once a resurgent Hume and Fichte.

"It is not needful to maintain that Mr. Mill is in every respect like either the great Scottish sceptic or the great German idealist, any more than to assert that these two are like each other. Mr. Mill is not so original a thinker as Hume, nor does he, like him, profess scepticism. He does not possess the speculative genius of Fichte, and he defends his system in a much more sober manner. But it can be shown that his philosophy comes very nearly to the positions taken up by Hume, when Hume is properly understood; and in maintaining that mind is a series of feelings aware of itself, and that matter is a possibility of sensations, he has reached conclusions quite as visionary as those of Fichte. As Hume brought out fully the results lying in the philosophy of Berkeley—as one of the offshoots of the philosophy of Locke, and as Fichte carried to their logical consequences certain of the fundamental principles of Kant, so Mr. Mill, and we may add, Mr. Herbert Spencer, are pursuing to their proper issues the doctrine floating in nearly all our later metaphysics, that we can know nothing of the nature of things." Pp. 231—2.

Dr. McCosh offers many judicious and valuable criticisms on Mill's logic, which show a just appreciation of its defects and its excellencies. Its faults arise chiefly from those great metaphysical, pyschological, and ontological errors which characterize his entire system. Formal logic he misconceives and underrates. As he makes experience the source of all our knowledge, and this experience consists solely in sensations, of course he denies all those self-evident axioms, those intuitive, a priori,

and necessary truths, which form the original premises for all reasoning, and are quite as essential to it as extension to figure, or light to colour. As he derives even axioms and first truths from inductive generalization, so it is in his treatment of induction, that the main power and value of his logic consist. And in pointing out the tests of the validity of universal inductive conclusions from particular instances, his logic is altogether peerless and invaluable. Our author also in this connection presents what we deem, on the whole, a just view of Hamilton's great advances at the opposite pole of logical science, *i. e.*, in formal logic. He awards deserved commendation to some of these innovations, while he repudiates others among the more extreme of them, as at least useless or worse than useless. Among these may be classed the quantification of negative predicates as particulars.

The radical principles of Mr. Mill's philosophy already brought to view of course make him a utilitarian in ethics, and a fatalist, if not rather an atheist, in divinity. Few writers could bring greater ingenuity to the support of these debasing schemes; still, when he comes to account for the idea and feeling of obligation expressed by the word "ought," as arising out of the mere conception of virtue as a means of happiness, it is the old paralogism over, of transmuting stones into gold, provided the gold be furnished beforehand. All attempts to define virtue as a compound or derivative from something more original or simple, or better than itself, presupposes virtue itself in the definition, or in the original elements out of which it is alleged to be compounded. It is in full consonance with his whole system, that Mill should tell us, "we venture to think that a religion may exist without a belief in a God, and that a religion without a God may be, even to Christians, an instructive and profitable object of contemplation." This needs no comment.

There are some points which we think admit of a more exact and clear analysis than that presented by our author in this and other works in which he has done such signal service to the cause of truth. We refer especially to some of his remarks in regard to *à priori* and necessary truth, and the relations of our knowledge of it to proofs from inductive generalization.

These, however, are too slight to be dwelt upon in our limited space, and constitute no serious drawback from the great value of the book. We close with the following summation by our author of this new philosophy.

"What have we left us according to this new philosophy? We have sensations; we have a series of feelings aware of itself, and permanent, or rather prolonged; and we have an association of sensations, and perceived resemblances, and possibilities of sensations. The sensations, and associations of sensation, generate ideas and beliefs, which do not, however, either in themselves or their mode of formation, guarantee any reality. We have an idea of an external material world; but Mr. Mill does not affirm that there is such a world, for there are laws of the series of feelings which would produce the idea, whether the thing existed or not; and our belief in it may be overcome—just as our natural belief in the sun rising is made to give way before the scientific conviction that it is the earth that moves. He thinks he is able by a process of inference to reach the existence of other beings besides ourselves. But the logic of the process is very doubtful. I believe that neither Mr. Mill nor any other has been able to show how, from sensations, individual or associated, we could ever legitimately infer the existence of anything beyond. What he claims to have found is after all only other 'series of feelings.'" Pp. 272—3.

The wide acceptance of this and other forms of philosophic scepticism is among the ominous symptoms of the day, and summons to a vigorous and united array against it, all who would contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

Art. V.—*The General Assembly.*

The General Assembly of 1866 was in many respects a remarkable body. It was numerously attended, two hundred and fifty-one members being present the first day. It embraced many men of distinguished ability. It came together at a time when the public mind, in the church and state, was deeply agitated. The questions presented for discussion included topics in which the whole community took the liveliest interest, and the conclusions arrived at are likely to have a very great and perhaps lasting influence on the character and destiny of the Presbyterian church.

As so much of the time of the Assembly was taken up with the case of the Louisville Presbytery, and so much of the debates had reference to documents which do not appear on the minutes, it is necessary, in order to understand the measures, and to account for the animus of the Assembly, to advert to some things which occurred prior to the meeting of that body.

"*Declaration and Testimony.*"

The action of the Assembly of 1865, having given offence to many ministers and elders, especially in the border states, the Presbytery of Louisville adopted and issued a "Declaration and Testimony," to which they solicited the adherence of those in all parts of the church who agreed with them in opinion. This document, making twenty-seven octavo pages, is much too long, notwithstanding its historical importance, to be inserted in this journal. It testifies against fourteen errors in doctrine and practice as to which it charges the General Assembly with having departed from "the faith and practice" enjoined by the Head of the church. It testifies, 1st, against "the assumption of the courts of the church, of the right to decide questions of state policy." 2d. "Against the doctrine that the church as such owes allegiance to human rulers or governments." 3d. Against the perversion of Christ's direction to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and the Apostle's command to be subject to the higher powers. 4th. Against "the action of the Assembly on the subject of slavery and

emancipation in 1864, and confirmed in 1865." 5th. Against "the unjust and scandalous contradiction of their own recorded testimony and well-known facts, in regard to the labours of the Presbyterian church and ministry, for the christianizing of the slaves of the South, and the preaching to them of the gospel of Christ." 6th. Against "the doctrine widely taught in the church, and even countenanced by the Assembly, that the acts and deliverances of the courts of Christ's commonwealth may properly be based upon, and shaped in accordance with the ordinances and laws of state legislatures, the orders and proclamations of military chieftains, and even the results of popular votes given at elections." 7th. "Against the doctrine that the will of God, as to the duty of the church and of his people, is to be learned from particular providential events, and that the teachings of the Scriptures are to be interpreted by these providences." 8th. "Against the sanction which has been given both directly and indirectly, to the usurpation by the secular and military powers of authority in and over the worship and government of the church."

In support of this charge they refer, among other things, to "the endorsement in word and act of such usurpation as perfectly right by the Seminaries at Princeton and Danville, as witness the doctrine laid down by the Princeton Professor of Theology, and the doctrine and practice of the Danville Professor in the same department." 9th. "Against the alliance which has been virtually formed, by the church with the state, by which the state has been encouraged, and even invited to use the church as an instrument for giving effect to its various schemes of a political character." 10th. "Against that persecution which has been carried on for these five years past, and with increasing malignity toward all those who have steadfastly refused to sanction or acquiesce in these departures of the church from the foundations of truth and righteousness." 11th. "Against the wide-spread and destructive perversion of the ministry and the province of church courts." 12th. "Against the action of the Assembly in reference to the churches in the seceded and border states, and against the basing of that action upon an assertion of what the Assembly had the clearest evidence was not true." 13th. "Against the act of

the Assembly by which the Board of Missions, *i. e.*, (the Executive Committee at Philadelphia or its Corresponding Secretary) were constituted a court of final and superior jurisdiction,—&c." 14th. Against all and every movement in the church, however cautiously or plausibly veiled, which looks to a union of the state with the church, or a subordination of the one to the other, or the interference of either with the jurisdiction of the other.

Reasons for this Testimony.

Against each and all these errors in doctrine and practice we testify:

1st. Because they are contrary to the word of God, and subversive of its inspiration and supreme authority as the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

2d. Because they are contrary to the doctrine of the Presbyterian church as taught in her catechisms, confessions, and constitution.

3d. Because they tend to obliterate all the lines of separation between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, &c.

4th. Because they brought the ministry and the ordinances of religion and the authority of the church into public disrepute.

5th. Because they tend to keep up strife and alienation among brethren of a common faith, and thus delay the pacification of the country.

6th. Because they are schismatical. "Those who invent new doctrines, who teach for doctrines the commandments of men, who bring in damnable heresies, are, by the word of God, adjudged as schismatics. It is not those who withdraw from such corruptors of the gospel that are chargeable with the sin of schism; but those who by their false teaching and scandalous practice render it necessary for the faithful to separate themselves in order to preserve their garments undefiled."

In the conclusion of this section they say: "We declare our deliberate purpose, trusting in God, who can save by a few as well as by many, to use our best endeavours to bring back the church of our fathers to her ancient purity and integrity, upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and under the

banner of our only King, Priest, and Prophet, the Lord Jesus Christ. In this endeavour we pledge ourselves to assist and coöperate with each other; and by the grace of God we will never abandon the effort, no matter what sacrifices it may require us to make, until we shall either have succeeded in reforming the church and restoring her tarnished glory; or, failing in this, necessity shall be laid upon us, in obedience to the apostolic command, to withdraw from those who have departed from the truth. Compelled to this course, we will go bearing with us the true Presbyterian church, with her doctrines, order, worship, and freedom, as they have been given her by her divine Head, and transmitted from generation to generation by the hands of saints, and confessors, and martyrs."

Action Proposed.

1. "That we refuse to give our support to ministers, elders, agents, editors, teachers, or to those who are in any other capacity engaged in religious instruction or effort, who hold the preceding or similar heresies.

2. "That we refuse to take any part in the discussion or decision by any ecclesiastical court, of those questions touching the policy and measures which do properly pertain to the civil commonwealth.

3. "That we will recognize no authority in the decision of questions of Christian doctrine or morals, or concerning the rights of the church or the duties of its members, other than the written word of God.

4. "That we will not take any oath prescribed by civil or military authority, as a qualification for sitting in a church court, or for worshipping God, or for preaching the gospel, or exercising any of the functions of the ministry. Nor will we sit in any judicatory thus constituted.

5. "That we will extend our sympathy and aid, as we may have opportunity, to all who in any way are subjected to ecclesiastical censure or civil disabilities or penalties, for their adherence to the principles we maintain, and the repudiation of the errors, in doctrine and practice, against which we bear this our testimony.

6. "That we will not sustain, or execute, or in any manner

assist in the execution of the orders passed at the last two Assemblies on the subject of slavery and loyalty; and with reference to the conducting of missions in the Southern states; and with regard to the ministers, members, and churches in the seceded and border states.

7. "That we will withhold our contributions from the Boards of the church (with the exception of the Board of Foreign Missions) and from the Theological Seminaries, until these institutions are rescued from the hands of those who are perverting them to the teaching and promulgation of principles subversive of the system they were founded and organized to uphold and disseminate. And we will appropriate the moneys thus withheld, in aid of those instrumentalities which may be employed for maintaining and defending the principles affirmed in this Declaration, against the errors herein rejected; and in assisting the impoverished ministers and churches anywhere throughout the country, who agree with us in these essential doctrines, in restoring and building up their congregations and houses of worship.

8. "We recommend that all Ministers, Elders, Church Sessions, Presbyteries and Synods who approve of this Declaration and Testimony, give their public adherence thereto in such manner as they shall prefer, and communicate their names, and when a church court, a copy of their adhering act.

9. "That inasmuch as our only hope of improvement and reformation in the affairs of our church depends upon the interposition of Him, who is King in Zion, that we will unceasingly and importunately supplicate a Throne of Grace, for the return of that purity and peace, the absence of which we now sorrowfully deplore.

10. "We do earnestly recommend that on the day of , A. D. 1865, a convention be held in the city of , composed of all such ministers and ruling elders as may concur in the views and sentiments of this testimony, to deliberate and consult on the present state of our church; and to adopt such further measures as may seem best suited to restore her prostrated standards, and vindicate the pure and peaceful religion of Jesus from the reproach which has been brought upon it, through the faithlessness and apostacy of its ministers and professors.

"And now, brethren, our whole heart is laid open to you, and to the world. If a majority of our church are against us (as we have too much reason to apprehend it is), they will, we suppose, in the end, either see the infatuation of their course, and retrace their steps, or they will, at last, attempt to cut us off. If the former, we shall bless the God of Jacob; if the latter, we desire to stand ready for the sake of Christ, and in support of the Testimony, now made, to endure whatever suffering may be required of us by our Lord. We have here frankly, openly, and candidly, laid before our erring brethren the course we are, by the grace of God, irrevocably determined to pursue. It is our steadfast aim to reform the church, or to testify against its errors and defections until testimony will be no longer heard. And we commit the issue to Him who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."

This document, in the pamphlet form, now before us, is signed by forty-one ministers and seventy-eight elders. Its publication produced a general feeling of apprehension. The severity of its language, its sweeping assertions, its charges of defection and heresy against the supreme judiciary of the church, its condemnation of principles and practices coeval with our organization, and its avowed schismatical object, offended the judgment and conscience of the great body of our members, ministers, and elders. It was, perhaps, an exaggerated apprehension of the strength of the party represented by the "Declaration and Testimony," which led to the call for a convention of ministers and elders who approved of the acts of the Assembly, and desired to sustain them, to meet at the same time and place as the Assembly itself. The abstract right of the people to meet together to express their own convictions, and to endeavour to mould the opinions of others, cannot be questioned. It is pushing this right, however, to a very dangerous extreme, for a convention to be called to sit side by side with a constitutional assembly, whether in the church or state, with the avowed or obvious purpose of influencing its action. Such a course can be justified only in times of the greatest emergency, when the appointed means of governing the church or state are deemed unworthy of confidence. In the present case, as the event shows, no such emergency existed.

The fact that this convention was attended by over a hundred members, shows, however, that no little apprehension was felt as to the effect which the "Declaration and Testimony" was likely to produce.

We fully sympathize in the disapprobation of the spirit, principles, and proposed mode of action set forth in that document, which has been so generally expressed. It is founded, from first to last, upon an erroneous theory of the office and prerogatives of the church; a theory which was advanced for a purpose, and was never acted upon by any branch of the church from the beginning. It assumes the church to be so spiritual in its nature and functions that it cannot recommend objects of benevolence, such as colonization, or temperance societies, nor testify against such glaring sins as the African slave-trade. It forbids all injunctions to Christians to be faithful, as citizens, to the Government under which they live. It is, among other things, against the acts of the Assembly, passed during the late war, declaring the duty of loyalty and obedience to the civil authorities, that the signers of this document testify. If this doctrine were to prevail, a seal would be set on the lips of the church, and she would be forbidden to testify against many sins, and to enjoin many duties which lie properly within her sphere. In consequence of this contracted view of the prerogative of the church, the Declaration refuses all regard not only to such acts and deliverances of the Assembly as may really transcend the limits of the constitution, but to many which are perfectly legitimate. The gravest objection, perhaps, to the document, is its openly schismatical character. Individual signers of the Declaration have, indeed, denied any intention to separate from the church. However true this may be of them, personally, there can be no doubt as to the meaning and design of the document itself. Its signers say: "We will not abandon the effort until we shall either have succeeded in reforming the church and restoring her tarnished glory, or, failing in this, necessity shall be laid upon us, in obedience to the apostolic command; to withdraw from those who have departed from the truth." It is not exclusion, but a voluntary withdrawing, in obedience to an apostolic injunction, that is here spoken of.

When the Synod of Kentucky met, Dr. R. J. Breckinridge

moved that those members of that body who have issued and signed this Declaration and Testimony should not be allowed to take their seats as members. This motion was lost; whereupon Dr. Breckinridge complained, and appealed to the General Assembly. It was under these circumstances the Assembly met. It was the Declaration and Testimony, and its consequences, which occupied most of the time of the House during its whole meeting, and which has so profoundly agitated the church and threatens still more serious evils.

Organization of the House.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America met, according to adjournment, in the Second Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, Missouri, on Thursday, the 17th day of May, 1866, at eleven o'clock A. M., and was opened with a sermon by the Rev. John C. Lowrie, D.D., Moderator of the last Assembly, from Acts i. 8: "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

The Moderator announced that the first business in order was the election of Moderator, and the Assembly proceeded to such election.

Rev. R. W. Allen nominated Rev. P. D. Gurley, D.D., of the Presbytery of the Potomac.

Rev. Dr. Krebs nominated Rev. R. L. Stanton, D.D., of the Presbytery of Chillicothe.

Rev. Dr. Brookes nominated Rev. S. R. Wilson, D.D., of the Presbytery of Louisville.

On motion of Rev. Dr. W. L. Breckinridge, it was

Resolved, That in all elections by this body, a majority of the votes cast be necessary to an election.

The roll was called, and Rev. R. L. Stanton, D.D., was then elected Moderator, having received 158 votes, to 75 cast for Rev. Dr. Gurley, and 18 for Rev. Dr. Wilson.

The Moderator appointed Rev. Dr. Krebs a committee to inform Rev. Dr. Stanton of his election, and conduct him to the chair.

Upon taking the chair, Dr. Stanton briefly addressed the Assembly as follows:

Fathers and Brethren: I need scarcely say that I am deeply sensible of the honour conferred upon me by being called to preside over your deliberations. This honour brings with it responsibilities and labours of no ordinary character. While thankful for this mark of your confidence, I shall endeavour to bring to the discharge of the duties of the chair an honest effort to advance the wishes of those whose servant only I am. A consciousness of my inability fully to meet the demands of the position you have given me, prompts me to throw myself upon your generous indulgence, and to ask your assistance in every proper way; while it is essential, in order that the business of the Assembly may be properly conducted, that we should unitedly seek the guidance of that wisdom which is from above. It has been said by many that this would be one of the most important General Assemblies of our church. There may be some truth in the estimate thus put upon what may prove to be the result of our deliberations. Vital questions, affecting the integrity of this Assembly and the purity and peace of the church at large, will claim from you a prompt and decisive solution. That rebellious defiance of lawful authority, which has racked this nation to its foundations during four years of war, still rages within the precincts where it was born—the church of God. To meet it promptly, courageously, in the fear of God, and with the aid of his grace, is your manifest duty, as well as directly to deal with those who openly deride your most solemn injunctions. To settle all these questions upon principles so clearly right that they shall command the confidence of the church and give it rest, and at the same time advance the Saviour's glory, should be the object of our labours. Then those who have gone out from us upon vain and wicked pretexts may be left to their own chosen way, and if any still remain to revile, they may know the cost of setting at defiance the authority which Christ has given to his church. The bare mention of these things shows how greatly we need a wisdom from above. Let us seek that wisdom and grace which God hath promised, and may he give success to the right!

The Moderator then announced that nominations for Temporary Clerk were in order.

Rev. M. J. Hickok, D.D., Rev. Everard Kempshall, and Rev. J. B. Davis, were nominated.

Upon calling the roll the Rev. Dr. Hickok was elected Temporary Clerk.

Exclusion of the Commissioners of the Louisville Presbytery.

It is understood to have been the programme of the convention to allow the whole matter concerning the Louisville Presbytery and the Declaration and Testimony to abide the issue of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge. This would have brought up the merits of the case, given all parties a fair hearing, and secured a regular judicial decision, against which there could be no appeal. This wise course was prevented by the introduction, on the first day of the session, by Dr. D. V. McLean, of the following paper, which threw everything into confusion:

WHEREAS, It is understood that the Presbytery of Louisville has openly defied the General Assembly, and refuses to submit to its orders, in a pamphlet adopted by it, of which the following is a specimen: "We will not sustain or execute, or in any manner assist in the execution of the orders passed at the last two Assemblies on the subject of loyalty or slavery, and which refer to the conducting of missions in the southern states, and with regard to ministers, members, or churches in the seceded or border states;" and

WHEREAS, Said Presbytery has commissioned and sent to this Assembly at least one Commissioner, who, if the orders of the last Assembly had been faithfully executed by said Presbytery, there is the strongest reason to believe, would have been suspended from the functions of the gospel ministry; therefore,

Resolved, That until the Assembly shall have examined and decided upon the conduct of said Presbytery, the Commissioners therefrom shall not be entitled to seats in this body.

Rev. Dr. W. L. Breckinridge moved to lay this paper on the table, on which motion

Rev. John Crozier called for the ayes and nays, which were ordered.

Ruling elder S. Galloway moved that the Assembly do now adjourn, which was lost.

The question was then taken on the motion to lay Dr. McLean's paper on the table, which was lost by 212 noes to 31 ayes.

Before taking a vote on Dr. McLean's paper the Assembly adjourned. The next day—

Rev. Dr. D. V. McLean briefly stated the purport of the paper offered by him yesterday in relation to Louisville Presbytery. He contended that the Assembly was, legally and properly, the judge of the qualifications of its members, and without entering into any defence of the principles of the paper, he moved the previous question on its adoption. After some time spent in raising and discussing points of order, the paper was adopted, under a call for the ayes and noes, by a vote of 201 ayes to 50 noes, and three excused from voting.

Rev. H. J. Van Dyke, D. D., Rev. A. P. Forman, Rev. J. T. Smith, D. D., and others gave notice of their intention to offer a protest against this action of the Assembly, and to ask that the same might be spread upon the minutes.

Rev. Dr. D. V. McLean then offered the following:

Resolved, That a Committee of seven—four ministers and three ruling elders—be appointed to examine into the facts connected with the alleged acts and proceedings of the Louisville Presbytery, and ascertain whether it is entitled to a representation in this General Assembly, and to recommend what action, if any, this Assembly should take in regard to said Presbytery.

Rev. Dr. West moved to lay this resolution on the table.

The motion was lost.

Rev. D. J. Waller moved to amend Dr. McLean's resolution by adding the following: "And that the case of Rev. T. A. Bracken, a commissioner from West Lexington Presbytery, and alleged to be at the same time a member of Lafayette Presbytery, and a pastor of a church within its bounds, be referred to the same Committee."

Rev. Dr. J. H. Brookes, of St. Louis Presbytery, offered the following additional amendment:—"And that the Committee be also instructed to inquire into the truth of certain rumours, charging other members of this body with the same offence for which the Presbytery of Louisville has been arraigned before

the Assembly, and report what action should be taken in the premises."

Dr. Brookes very naturally and honourably desired the action of the Assembly to be directed against all those who were in the same category. As he and others had signed the Declaration and Testimony, he insisted they were as much responsible as the Louisville Presbytery, by which it had been adopted, and therefore if the members of that Presbytery were to be censured, he and other signers of the document should be included in the same condemnation. To this, however, the Assembly did not, at least in the first instance, agree, but confined its attention to the Presbytery and its commissioners.

Dr. Van Dyke, Dr. Anderson, Mr. Forman, and Mr. Bracken, spoke in favour of the proposed amendment. They insisted that it would be partial and unjust to deal exclusively with the Louisville Presbytery, while so many others held, and had avowed, substantially the same sentiments. Mr. Forman said that Dr. Hodge in the protest presented to the Assembly of 1861, and Dr. R. J. Breckinridge in the Synod of Kentucky, had pronounced the action of the Assembly unconstitutional and unscriptural. Dr. Anderson said the Synod of Missouri by a vote of three to one had adopted the main points involved in the Declaration and Testimony. Mr. Bracken said that the Synod of Kentucky without a dissenting voice had adopted the paper of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge condemning the action of the Assembly of 1861. Subsequently the action of the Synods of New Jersey and Philadelphia declaring that the certain deliverances and injunctions, in the form of rules of procedure adopted by the Assembly of 1865, were not binding on the churches, until they had been sanctioned by the Presbyteries, were cited as putting those Synods on the same ground with the signers of the Declaration and Testimony.

We presume that Dr. Hodge and Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, to say nothing of the venerable Synods referred to, are perfectly willing to bear the responsibility of their own declarations. It tends however to nothing but confusion and misrepresentation to confound things essentially different. There is as much difference between the protest to the Assembly of 1861, and the action of the Synod of Kentucky on the one hand, and the

Declaration and Testimony on the other, as there is between Dr. R. J. Breckinridge and Dr. Stuart Robinson. These gentlemen are very pronounced in their antagonism, and cannot easily be put into the same class, nor can the documents of which they were severally the authors or advocates. All that the protest against the Spring resolutions of 1861 said was, that it was not the province of the General Assembly to interpret the constitution of the United States, and to decide whether the allegiance of the citizen is primarily due to his own state or to the Uniðn. This is the precise ground taken by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge and the Synod of Kentucky. In his paper adopted by that body, it is said, "In the judgment of a large majority of the Assembly (of 1861), and of multitudes in the church, the subject-matter of the action, in the premises, being purely political, was incompetent to a spiritual court. Undoubtedly it was incompetent to the Assembly, as a spiritual court, to require or advise acts of disobedience to actual governments, by those under the power of those governments—in the manner and under the circumstances which existed; and still further, it was neither wise nor discreet for the Assembly of the whole church to disregard, in its action, the difficulties and dangers which render it absolutely impossible for large portions of the church to obey its order, without being liable to the highest penalties. . . . . The Synod contents itself with this expression of its grave disapprobation of this action of the Assembly—which the Synod judges to be repugnant to the word of God, as that word is interpreted in our Confession of Faith."—The Synod thus expressly endorses the minority of the Assembly of 1861 in their protest, and adopts identically the same principle. If therefore, their protest, contains, as has been asserted, the seeds of all the heresy and treason which have since been propagated in the church, Dr. R. J. Breckinridge's paper contains the same seeds transplanted from the open air into a steaming hot-bed. The truth, however, is, that neither paper contains either heresy or treason. They simply assert a principle which, *in thesi* at least, no man can deny. In perfect consistency with their former action, the signers of the protest of 1861, and the members of the Synod of Kentucky, united in Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies,

in the strongest appeals and exhortations to the people of the non-seceding states, to be loyal to the national government and zealous in its support. But it is against such appeals and exhortations the Declaration and Testimony formally testifies, and condemns them as evidence of the departure of the church from the faith and practice prescribed by the word of God and its own standards. In this matter, therefore, there is a great gulf between the two parties.

In the second place, all that the Synods of New Jersey, Philadelphia, and virtually those of Baltimore and Kentucky, did in reference to the action of the Assembly of 1865, was to declare that in their judgment no mere deliverance of the Assembly (not sitting in its judicial capacity) is binding on the conscience of the people; nor can it be obligatory on the lower courts to require of applicants for ministerial or Christian communion to approve of such deliverances. This is all that this journal had asserted on this subject. This again is a point about which there can be no difference of opinion. There may be difference in words, and in practice. The principle may be violated, and those may be denounced who maintain it, but it cannot be denied. It is written, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." If Paul required the Galatians to pronounce an apostle or an angel from heaven anathema, if he preached another gospel (and whether it was another, they were the judges), surely we cannot be required to submit to the declarations and ordinances of any body of men on earth, if we judge them to be contrary to the Scriptures. No deliverance of the Assembly therefore can be imposed as binding on the people or upon inferior judicatories, which either transcends the limits of church power, or is contrary to the constitution, or in contravention of the word of God. This is a principle, which, as we have said, does not admit of dispute. Dr. Thomas, in his speech before the late Assembly, said, that the Assembly had made deliverances which he deemed to be contrary to the Scriptures. It is of course out of the question that he could either adopt those deliverances himself, or impose them upon others. Dr. West in the Assembly of 1865, said, that if the Assembly should order the northern Presbyteries and sessions to disci-

pline those of their number who had aided, encouraged, or abetted the late rebellion, "there is not a church in New York which would not snap its fingers at such action," of course Dr. West cannot, with the least self-respect, or with the slightest regard to the good opinion of honest men, attempt to enforce obedience to such action on his brethren.

Had the Declaration and Testimony confined itself to testifying in behalf of the principle in question, and confined the application of it to proper limits, there would have been no ground of complaint. But it refuses to recognize the authority of acts which are fully in accordance with the constitution and the Scriptures, and denounces as heretical doctrines which the Presbyterian church has ever recognized as true and sound. It testifies against all deliverances during the late war, exhorting the people to loyalty and the support of the government. It denies that the church, as such, owes allegiance to any human government. Its authors, in their recent address, condemn the Assembly for making patriotism a Christian virtue (as though honesty, although a natural duty, was not also a matter of Christian obligation); they accuse that venerable body of "asserting the bold Erastian heresy, that the revealed will of the Lord Jesus Christ is the supreme law of the land, directly in the face of the Scriptures, as interpreted by the symbols of the Scottish Reformation, and the fathers of the Westminster Assembly." This heresy, so called, has been propounded by high judicial authority in our civil courts. It is nothing more than the assertion of a truth which all Christians admit, viz., that the will of Christ binds all men to whom it is revealed in all their circumstances and relations. It is one thing, therefore, to protest against acts which transcend the constitution, and another to pronounce nugatory or heretical acts and declarations which are perfectly scriptural and constitutional.

In the third place. Many wise and worthy men were convinced that Congress had not the constitutional right to establish a national bank, or to conduct internal improvements. They openly avowed this conviction. They endeavoured to demonstrate its unsoundness, and to induce others to agree with them. In all this they were exercising the clear right of freemen. But if they had gone further, and not only denounced

Congress as apostate, but avowed their determination to break up the Union, to separate themselves from the central government, and to proclaim themselves the true United States, unless the majority would adopt their peculiar views, their conduct would have deserved and received universal reprobation. In like manner there are many in the church, whole Synods and Presbyteries, who believe that the General Assembly, in certain acts, transcended the limits of the constitution. This opinion they avowed and endeavoured to sustain. But they neither desired, purposed, nor organized any factious opposition or combined resistance, much less any separation or schism. The signers of the Declaration and Testimony, however, not satisfied with protesting against the acts in question, extended, most unreasonably, their denunciations and criminations, and put themselves in the position of schismatics by avowing the purpose of separation, and adopting the incipient measures for the execution of that purpose. Nothing, therefore, can be more unreasonable than the attempt to identify with them the Synods of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Baltimore, and Kentucky, or such men as Dr. Breckinridge, Dr. Hodge, Dr. Thomas, and Dr. West. The gulf between the two classes is wide and deep.

Dr. Thomas spoke against the amendments and in favour of the resolution for the appointment of a committee. His speech was characterized by the skill he always manifests in popular address. He endeavoured to draw a distinction between the Presbytery of Louisville and individual signers of the Declaration and Protest. The one was an organized body, directly amenable to the Assembly; the other might claim that they were exercising their personal right of protest or dissent. This distinction does not appear to us to be sound. If the adoption of the Declaration disqualified the Presbytery to send Commissioners, it disqualified its signers to sit as members. This the Assembly itself ultimately admitted, and by special vote permitted those of its members who had adopted the obnoxious document to retain their seats.

Dr. Thomas, after the conclusion of his speech, moved the previous question, which motion prevailed. The amendments were thus cut off, and the vote on the main question was decided

in favour of adopting the resolution for the appointment of a committee.

The Commissioners of the Presbytery excluded from their seats by the action of the Assembly presented the following paper, viz.

To the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, now in session in St. Louis.

The undersigned, Commissioners from the Presbytery of Louisville, deem it both respectful to the Assembly, and demanded by the interests of truth and righteousness, to lay before the body, through you, in this formal and official manner, for record on the minutes, their views and purposes in regard to the resolution passed yesterday, under operation of the previous question, to this effect:

"That, WHEREAS the Presbytery of Louisville have 'openly defied the Assembly,' and declared publicly their intention not to enforce the orders of the two last Assemblies on slavery and loyalty, &c., and have, in act, disregarded them in sending a Commissioner here, who, by a faithful execution of those acts, would probably have been suspended from the functions of his office; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That until the Assembly shall have examined and decided upon the conduct of said Presbytery, the Commissioners shall not be entitled to seats in this body."

We respectfully suggest, not indeed as vital to the case, but as illustrating simply the evil of such action, under the operation of the previous question, cutting off all explanation, that both the premises of the Assembly's resolution contain grave mistakes of facts. The Presbytery of Louisville have indeed published a Declaration and Testimony against the acts of the five preceding Assemblies, in which many ministers and elders outside the Presbytery, formally, and many more in spirit and act, have concurred. But the Presbytery of Louisville have not "openly defied the Assembly," as might have been seen by reference to the whole tenor of the paper, from which a single passage is quoted. Nor have the Presbytery sent any Commissioner here, who, even under the act of 1865, in relation to ministers who have gone into the Confederacy, or fled or been banished into foreign countries, could have been suspended from

the ministry. Since the only one of their Commissioners who has been absent from the country during the past three years, was neither in the Confederacy, nor fled, nor was banished; but, being absent on a vacation tour, by arrangements made months before, at the inauguration of an unlimited military power under the control of his bitter ecclesiastical enemies, prolonged that absence, with the advice and concurrence of the church session and of prudent friends of all parties.

Aside, however, from these mistakes of fact in the premises, a far more important matter, in our judgment, is the dangerous error in principle involved in such action, even were the facts as charged. On this view of the case, we beg leave, with all respect and deference, to suggest:

1. It will be manifest, on due reflection, and would have been shown, but for the call for the previous question, that the assumption of the right to take such action under the general power of any deliberative body to judge of the qualifications of its own members, arises from a failure to see the want of analogy between the case of the General Assembly and that of legislative and other similar bodies in the secular sphere. The right to appoint Commissioners to the General Assembly, and to judge of the qualifications of those Commissioners, is inherent in the Presbyteries, whose members are a constituent part of the Assembly itself; nor can they be divested of that right save by sentence of deposition from office as Presbyters, reached through the forms so carefully prescribed in the constitution. The claim of any particular Assembly to judge of the qualifications of its own members must be limited in the nature of the case to the question whether the credentials are in accordance with the provisions of the book. But in fact the Assembly in this instance does not pretend to be passing judgment upon the qualifications of its own members at all, but upon the constituency which sent them. This is manifest, not only from the terms of the action, but also from the fact that one of the Commissioners excluded was no party to the "Declaration and Testimony;" neither could he be possibly objected to on the score of disqualification or a defective commission.

2. This, therefore, makes manifest what was confessed on the floor of the Assembly by some who voted for this resolution,

that the action was *in its nature judicial*, and it is therefore, in effect, a judicial sentence, pronounced and executed, not only in disregard of all the provisions for a fair trial so carefully ordained in our constitution, but, under the operation of the previous question, excluding the parties charged from a word of explanation, defence, or protest.

3. And it adds to the aggravation of the wrong done in this action; that, even had the Assembly the right thus to act, and were its action according to the forms of law and the sentence given after a fair hearing, it is a sentence of disgrace, as if inflicted for crime committed, whereas what was done by the Presbytery could at most be regarded as only the mistaken exercise of the right of protest against what was conceived to be an act of usurpation by the Assembly.

4. A further aggravation of this wrong is the manifest partiality evinced, in thus singling out for condemnation the Presbytery of Louisville, while, notoriously, a large number, if not a majority of the churches in all parts of the country, but also several Presbyteries represented in the Assembly, have *done* precisely the thing which the Louisville Presbytery is condemned for asserting its purpose to do.

5. But a still more important and dangerous principle involved in this action, is, that it takes away from minorities, and even individual members of the body, all those safeguards provided for their protection against the violence and partisan feeling of a casual majority of members in all times of excitement and passion. The principle of this action, if admitted, would inevitably and speedily change the Assembly from an *ecclesia*, organized, restrained and governed by the well established laws of Christ's house, into a mere ecclesiastical gathering under the unlimited control of the majority of members, "the most part knowing not wherefore they have come together."

6. It but evinces more clearly and aggravates the wrong done in this case, that the Assembly resolves not absolutely and finally to exclude us, but only to exclude us until the Assembly "*shall have examined and decided.*" The right to examine and decide under such a resolution; the right to exclude us, even for an hour, pending such examination; the right to exclude us after such examination is had, and the right absolutely and

finally to exclude us, are all equally groundless. The injury inflicted upon the good name of the Presbytery among the churches from a temporary exclusion, as though *probably* guilty of high crime, is *scarcely less* than the injury from a sentence of final exclusion. Besides, even though it was consistent with our proper self-respect, and with the honour of the Presbytery for us to await the result of the Assembly's inquisition, thereby recognizing the Assembly's right thus "to examine and decide," we are cut off, by the sentence of exclusion, from the exercise of any right of defence. All of which makes it still more palpably manifest that the action of the Assembly is, in effect, the pronouncing and executing of sentence, and afterward proceeding "to examine and decide."

With profound respect for the Assembly as the highest court of the church, and with unfeigned sorrow that we are constrained, in fidelity to our trust, thus to speak, we feel it our duty to say to the Assembly, that—Regarding this action as of the nature of a judgment upon the Presbytery and its Commissioners, and this judgment a sentence of exclusion without trial or a hearing in any form in explanation or defence; regarding this action as not only unjust, injurious, and cruel, but as subversive of the foundations of all justice, destructive of the constitution of the church, and revolutionary in its nature; regarding it as setting a precedent for the exercise of a partizan power in the courts of Christ's kingdom, which leaves all the rights and immunities of His people at the mercy of any faction that may casually be in the ascendancy—we should be untrue to the Presbytery whose commission we bear, faithless to the cause of truth and Christian freedom, false to our Lord and King, should we silently acquiesce in such procedure, or in any way recognize its legality. We must regard this action in its effect, so far as relates to us as Commissioners, and to this present Assembly, as final in the case.

With these views and convictions, there is but one course left open to us, viz., To take our appeal at once upon the issue, as it has been made for us and forced upon us, from this General Assembly to the Presbytery of Louisville in particular, in so far as it concerns ourselves and that body, and to the *whole church* in so far as it is an issue involving the great

principles of her constitution, and, indeed, her continued existence as a free Christian commonwealth in the enjoyment of the franchises and immunities conferred upon her by her adorable Head.

We therefore respectfully inform the Assembly that we shall not attend further upon its sessions.

STUART ROBINSON,
SAM'L R. WILSON,
MARK HARDIN,
C. A. WICKLIFFE.

St. Louis, Mo., May 19, 1866.

Dr. Boardman then offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the paper just received from the Commissioners from the Presbytery of Louisville be referred to the special committee having charge of that matter, and that said committee be instructed to report, with the least practicable delay, as to the expediency of re-admitting said Commissioners to their seats, till the case be disposed of.

This resolution Dr. Boardman supported in an able, earnest, and eloquent speech. He insisted that as these Commissioners were regularly appointed and presented themselves with credentials approved by our own committees, and thereupon enrolled, they had as good a right to sit, deliberate, and vote, as any other members of the House. To deprive them of this right was an act of great injustice, transcending the legitimate authority of the Assembly. There were no definite charges, merely "alleged acts," for which no defence or explanation was admitted. Such a course of action endangered the standing of every member of the Assembly, as any man was liable to be condemned unheard. It could not fail to arouse public sentiment against the Assembly, as well as to produce dissatisfaction and alienation in the church, and thus lead to serious evils. These and other ideas were expanded and pressed by the speaker with great clearness and force.

Dr. Hornblower took substantially the same view. He urged with clearness and ability the objections to the peremptory action which had been adopted. 1. That the exclusion of the Commissioners of the Presbytery of Louisville was unprecedented. 2. That it was for an act in which the Synod of

New Jersey (of which the mover of the resolution excluding the said Commissioners was a member), had concurred. This action of the Synod, although adopted late in the evening, was sanctioned after the matter had been well considered by a committee, and when the Synod was as full as usual. 3. That the mover framed the resolution without conference, made a speech in its support, and then moved the previous question. This he considered a very objectionable proceeding. 4. That there is often an impatience at the forms of justice. Men are satisfied if substantial justice is done, without regard to the means by which it is accomplished. This is a great evil. He disapproved of the conduct of the Louisville Presbytery, and thought it deserved censure, but at the same time held, that the exclusion of its Commisioners, in the manner by which it was effected, was unconstitutional.

The Hon. Isaac D. Jones also argued in favour of Dr. Boardman's resolution. He insisted that the Commissioners of the Louisville Presbytery were entitled to their seats, because they had been regularly appointed. 2. Because the right of a body to judge of the qualifications of its own members is a right regulated by law which determines the mode of its exercise. 3. It must be exercised before the members are admitted to their seats, and not after they have been regularly enrolled. 4. He reviewed the analogies which had been sought in justification of the action of the Assembly, derived from the acts of legislative bodies and civil courts. A court may indeed punish summarily for contempt. But it must be contempt of itself, and committed in its presence. In the case of the Louisville Presbytery, the contempt complained of, if committed, which he questioned, was against former Assemblies, not against the body then in session. No man ever heard of a court punishing a contempt committed against its predecessors. Mr. Giddings, when expelled for a contempt of the House of Representatives, when re-elected was freely admitted by its successor. 5. Mr. Jones further argued that the Louisville Presbytery had done nothing more than many of those on the other side had done with regard to the fugitive slave law. That law had been pronounced unconstitutional, condemned as cruel and unjust, and its execution in various ways impeded.

In this debate the Hon. S. Galloway followed Dr. Boardman, and made the principal speech against the adoption of his resolution. He defended the action of the Assembly in the exclusion of the Louisville Commissioners, which it was the object of Dr. Boardman's resolution to reverse, 1st, on the ground of the inherent power of the Assembly and the binding force of its decisions. On this point he quoted freely from the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in our celebrated Church Case. In his judgment Chief Justice Gibson said: "The decisions of every council, to which parties refer a matter for adjudication, is binding, though it be a mere informal reference to a neighbour. The decisions of the General Assembly, or any other of these general councils, is as binding on all the churches and congregations within its jurisdiction, in spiritual affairs, as the decision of a state tribunal in civil affairs. All are bound to submit to such decisions." He cited also the following passage from Mr. Hubbell, one of the counsel in the Church Case, as containing a sound exposition of our constitution: "From the decision of this great council there is no appeal; and when the General Assembly declares a doctrine heretical, it must no longer be heard in a Presbyterian church. Its maintainers must either conform to this decision or go elsewhere, and form new associations; of which they may, at their pleasure, make what are heresies, when compared with our standards. This decision of the General Assembly is the decision of the majority of that Assembly, and hence it results, (however harsh it may seem,) that the construction which the majority put upon the standards is orthodoxy, and that of the minority is heresy. This power is necessary to and inherent in every church establishment, or it ceases to be a church, call it what you please. This decision may be given either in the process of a judicial trial, and be the sentence upon an individual heretic, or it may be an abstract declaration of the Assembly, or 'bearing of testimony' against heretical doctrines. In whatever form this declaration of the Assembly may be given against a particular opinion, that opinion is heresy, and must be abandoned by the faithful. The malcontents have no alternative but submission or secession."

He argued at length to show that the decisions of the Assembly are final and binding, that we are bound to obey them. This is the doctrine of the church, he said, as laid down by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. He read as follows: "The whole power of the Presbyterian Church is concentrated in the General Assembly. Notwithstanding that supreme judicatory of the church has entrusted the exercise of this power, in many cases, to the inferior church judicatories, the Synods, Presbyteries, and church sessions, yet as the General Assembly exercises an appellate jurisdiction over all these inferior judicatories, and is the tribunal of dernier resort, the whole power of those judicatories concentrates in the General Assembly as the primeval fountain of ecclesiastical power. It exercises the same power over the decisions of the inferior judicatories that the Supreme Court in this state exercises over the decisions of the inferior courts. And you cannot arraign the Supreme Court, on an accusation of abusing its power, by reviewing the proceedings of an inferior court; whilst it would undoubtedly be an abuse of power, should the inferior refuse to allow an appeal to be taken from their judgment."

2d. He appealed to the action of the Assembly in 1837–8, in cutting off Synods and Presbyteries without a hearing. 3d. To the action of state legislatures and courts. 4th. The Presbytery was under process by the appeal of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge. It was under process from the day notice was given of that appeal. The question simply is, whether the Commissioners from that Presbytery shall be allowed to sit and deliberate until that appeal is issued. We say they shall not, because of their reproachful and rebellious language against the supreme court of the Presbyterian Church.

Finally, on the motion of Mr. H. K. Clarke, Dr. Boardman's resolution was divided. The first part, viz., "That the memorial of Dr. S. Robinson, and others, be referred to the committee of seven appointed to make inquiry in the matter of the Presbytery of Louisville," was adopted. The remainder was laid upon the table.

Rev. Dr. Van Dyke presented and read the following protest, signed by himself and sixteen others, against the action of the Assembly in excluding the Commissioners of the Louisville

Presbytery from the Assembly without hearing them, and pending an investigation into the conduct of that Presbytery.

PROTEST.

We, the undersigned, respectfully protest against what we deem to be the mischievous and erroneous judgment of the General Assembly, in suspending the Commissioners from the Presbytery of Louisville from the exercise of their rights and privileges as members of this body, for the following reasons:

1. By this act the Assembly has violated the fundamental principles of its own organization, and vitiated its own integrity as the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian Church. It is declared in chapter xii. of the *Form of Government*, that the General Assembly "shall represent in one body *all* the particular churches of this denomination;" and again, the General Assembly "shall consist of an equal delegation of bishops and elders from each Presbytery." It cannot be denied that at the time their representatives were excluded from the Assembly, the churches composing the Presbytery of Louisville were, and still are, an integral part of the Presbyterian Church. And yet the Assembly, by a simple resolution, adopted under the operation of the previous question, without debate, excluded these churches from all participation in its proceedings at a time when the business under consideration was of vital importance to the said churches. For such a course of action there is no warrant in the constitution, and no precedent in the history of the church. The attempt to justify it by the usage of legislative and other political assemblies, is, in the judgment of the undersigned, utterly futile; because, in the first place, there is no proper analogy between legislative bodies or other secular assemblies, acting under rules of human invention, and the court of Jesus Christ, organized under, and bound by the laws of Christ, as expounded in its own written constitution; and because, secondly, if such an analogy did exist, it has been violated in this case in the following essential particulars: 1. By the action of its own Committee on Commissions, and by the formal adoption of their report, the Assembly had already decided that the Commissioners from the Presbytery of Louisville were entitled to their seats. 2. In legislative and other

secular assemblies, when the right of members to the seats they have obtained is contested, they are always allowed to retain their places in the body, and to participate in its proceedings until the case is fully decided.

2. By this act the Assembly has virtually pronounced a judicial condemnation upon the Presbytery of Louisville without observing any of the forms of trial so carefully prescribed by the constitution, and so essential to the due administration of justice. And, in the opinion of the undersigned, this proceeding is rendered the more irregular and unjust in view of the fact that, by the operation of the previous question on the adoption of the resolution excluding them, the Commissioners were denied a hearing before the Assembly, either in their own behalf, or in the behalf of the Presbytery they represent. And this disregard of judicial forms is further aggravated by the fact, that in the resolution excluding the Commissioners from their seats, the Assembly endorsed unsustained public rumours against the ministerial character and standing of one of the said Commissioners, and made these rumours, thus endorsed, without any judicial proof, a ground of condemnation against the Presbytery.

3. The facts alleged against the Presbytery of Louisville do not involve any heresy or crime, nor justify the exclusion of the churches comprising said Presbytery from the fellowship of the church of Christ. Inasmuch as "all synods or councils since the days of the apostles"—being composed of uninspired and fallible men—"may err, and many have erred," the right to publicly discuss, dispute, and protest against the deliverances of such synods and councils belongs to every other ecclesiastical body, and to every, even the humblest, member of the church. This right has been exercised from the foundation of the church till the present time, and has never been disputed except by the Church of Rome. Moreover, the deliverances and orders of the General Assemblies, against which the Presbytery of Louisville have protested, and which they have refused to obey, not having been transmitted to the Presbyteries for their approbation, (according to the requisition of the *Form of Government*, chap. xii., sec. 6,) are not "established as constitutional rules;" neither are they "obligatory upon the churches." To exclude the churches of the Presbytery of Louisville from representa-

tion in this body for refusing to do that which, according to express provisions of the constitution, was not obligatory on them, is, in the judgment of the undersigned, an unwarranted and alarming usurpation of power.

For the foregoing and other reasons, in the name of Jesus Christ, by virtue of the right secured to them in the constitution, and in the discharge of their covenant obligations to study the purity and peace of the church, the undersigned do solemnly protest against this whole proceeding, as being unconstitutional and revolutionary, as calculated to bring the lawful authority of this Assembly into contempt, to enkindle strife and produce alienation, and to defeat the end for which the Assembly was originally organized, viz., that it might "constitute the bond of union, peace, correspondence, and mutual confidence among all our churches."

Henry J. Van Dyke,	Glass Marshall,
R. K. Smoot,	James H. Brookes,
J. L. Yantis,	John M. Travis,
A. P. Forman,	Thomas A. Bracken,
L. P. Bowen,	J. W. Pryor,
R. L. McAfee,	Geo. W. Buchanan,
Isaac D. Jones,	J. T. Hendrick,
G. C. Swallow,	P. Thompson,
S. J. P. Anderson,	W. M. Ferguson.

On motion of Rev. Dr. West, it was

Resolved, That the protest be admitted to record, and that a special committee be appointed to answer it.

To this protest the following answer was on a subsequent day returned:

The paper upon which the Assembly acted in the exclusion of the Commissioners of the Louisville Presbytery from their seats in this body until their case should be decided, indicates sufficiently the true ground of that action. It is no other than the constitutional right of the General Assembly to protect its own dignity, and vindicate its own authority, as the supreme tribunal of the church, in view of open insult to that dignity, and open defiance to that authority, by an inferior court, subject to its jurisdiction.

1. The argument of the protestants that the Assembly has, by this action, violated the fundamental law of its organization

in this respect, that no Assembly can be constitutionally valid unless *all* the particular churches and Presbyteries under its care are actually represented in the body, is an utter misinterpretation of the constitution, and the assertion of a principle that would vitiate the validity of nearly every meeting of the Assembly, and render the organization of any Assembly almost an impossibility. So conspicuous a fallacy as that of confounding the fundamental law and right of representation with the actual presence of the whole company of the representatives themselves, needs only the statement of the fallacy in order to furnish its refutation, not to mention the various clauses of the fundamental law which evince its glaring absurdity. (*Form of Government*, chap. xii.)

2. In reply to the protestants' assertion that there is no warrant in the constitution, no precedent in the history of the church, and no sufficient analogy for such exclusion, to be found in any secular assemblies whatever, the Assembly simply utters the counter assertion. The protestants, moreover, err greatly in supposing that the Assembly is organized by any "formal adoption" of the report of the Committee on Commissions, or that the *ex officio* organization of the Assembly by the clerks of the house, as the ministerial officers of the Assembly, renders impossible any subsequent action of the Assembly in reference either to the Commissioners themselves, or to the Presbyteries, which are the electors of these Commissioners. The power of the Assembly to determine claims of membership in its body, involves the power to decide whether the electors have, by any act, or acts, so far disqualified themselves as, *pro tempore*, to forfeit their right of representation in the supreme tribunal of the church. *McElroy's Report of the Presbyterian Church Case*, 1839, p. 171; *Assembly's Digest*, revised ed., p. 726, § 126.

3. The protestants, moreover, utterly misrepresent the action of the Assembly in the exclusion of the Commissioners of the Louisville Presbytery, by denouncing it as a "judicial condemnation" of the Presbytery without a regular trial. So far from this being the case, the truth is, that the action of the Assembly was only the suspension of the functions of the Commissioners, interdicting their participation in the deliberations of this body until their case should be decided, in the consideration of which case the Commissioners were not only allowed, but particularly invited, by formal vote, to appear, discuss the

case, and defend the action of their Presbytery to the fullest extent. The allegation that the Assembly decided the case of the Commissioners of the Louisville Presbytery merely upon public rumours, without proof, is entirely untrue.

4. It is unnecessary to enter upon any detailed denial of the protestation that the Louisville Presbytery has done nothing that can, by any possibility, justify the Assembly in the suspension of the privileges of the Commissioners. The Presbytery, according to its own "Declaration and Testimony" is in admitted, open, and persistent defiance of the authority of the Assembly, by its lifting up a standard of revolt in the church, and by its call upon all Presbyterians to send in "adhering acts," and thus engage in rebellious, heretical, and schismatical conduct, and so the Assembly has judged. In reference also to the doctrine that no decrees and determinations of the General Assembly are of binding force upon the inferior judicatories, unless previously submitted to the Presbyteries, and approved by a majority of the same, the Assembly declares that this is simply a violent wresting of chap. xii. sec. 6, *Form of Government*, from its historical connection and design, and in opposition not only to the usage of the church in past days, but also to the careful decision of the whole matter, as it emerged in the early controversies of the church. (*Digest*, p. 49, 50.)

5. As to the right of protest by any individual or court in the Presbyterian Church, the Assembly fully recognizes the same. But it is utterly unendurable, as it is utterly unconstitutional, to prostitute or pervert the right of dissent and respectful protest to the ends intended by the Louisville Presbytery, to wit, to open rebellion against the authority of this body, to the propagation of a vast brood of fatal heresies, to bitter misrepresentation of the acts of the Assembly, and to the organization of conspiracies against the very existence of the church itself.

6. The declaration of the protestants that, by the Assembly's action, the churches under the care of the Louisville Presbytery have been excluded "from the fellowship of the church of Christ," is illegitimate, illogical, and gratuitous. There is not a particle of evidence to justify the implication that the Assembly deals with the churches under its care, in precisely the same way in which it has dealt with the Louisville Presbytery. Should every minister of the Presbytery be not only suspended

from his ecclesiastical functions, but deposed from the gospel ministry, the churches of the Presbytery would still remain in connection with and under the care of the Assembly, until, by their own act of insubordination, they had rendered themselves obnoxious to the censures, and judicial or legislative discipline of this supreme tribunal, and thereby been lawfully excluded from our connection, or had voluntarily withdrawn themselves to go elsewhere.

N. WEST,
W. T. FINDLEY,
F. T. BROWN.

Thus ended the discussions referring to the exclusion of the Commissioners of the Presbytery of Louisville. The whole subject, however, was resumed and occupied a large share of the remaining sessions of the Assembly, being brought up again in the report of the committee of seven, so often referred to.

Report on the Presbytery of Louisville.

That report is so long that we cannot insert it at length. It is drawn up with marked ability, and presents the case against the Louisville Presbytery in the strongest light. We do not think that any speech or document on that side of the question presents so plausible an argument in defence of the proposed action of the Assembly.

It states that three subjects had been committed to their consideration. 1. To examine and report the acts and proceedings of the Presbytery of Louisville. 2. To inquire whether the said Presbytery, in view of the action referred to, is entitled to a seat in this Assembly. 3. To recommend what action, if any, the General Assembly should take in the premises.

Under the first head, the committee give an analysis of the Declaration and Testimony. Under the second they urge that the Commissioners of the Presbytery should be debarred from sitting in the Assembly, because it was discretionary to suspend from the privilege of a seat in a judicatory the parties who were under process. The Presbytery was under process from the time the Assembly appointed a committee to examine into the action. Under the third head, the committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Be it Resolved by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America:

First. That the Presbytery of Louisville be, and hereby is, dissolved; and that the custody of its records, papers, and other property be transferred as hereinafter ordered.

Second. That a new Presbytery be and is hereby constituted, to be known by the same name, occupy the same territory, and have watch and care of the same churches; said Presbytery to be composed of the following ministers, (together with so many elders as may appear,) viz., Rev. D. T. Stuart, W. W. Hill, S. Williams, W. C. Matthews, R. Valentine, B. H. McCown, J. H. Dinsmore, H. C. Sachse, T. A. Hoyt, J. L. McKee, J. P. McMillan, J. McCrae, H. T. Morton, J. C. Young, or so many of them, whether ministers or ruling elders, as shall, before their organization, subscribe the following formula, viz., "I do hereby profess my disapproval of the Declaration and Testimony adopted by the late Presbytery of Louisville, and my obedience in the Lord to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States," which formula, together with the subscribers' names, shall be subsequently entered upon these records. The said Presbytery shall meet in the Chestnut street church, in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, on the 20th day of June, 1866, at the hour of eleven o'clock A. M., and shall be opened with a sermon by the Rev. J. P. McMillan, or in his absence, the oldest minister present, who shall preside until a Moderator is chosen.

Third. That so many ministers belonging to the late Presbytery of Louisville as are not herein named, are hereby directed to apply for admission to the Presbytery now constituted, as soon after its organization as practicable, and they shall be received only on condition of acknowledging before the Presbytery their error in adopting or signing the Declaration and Testimony, and of subscribing the aforesaid formula on its records. If at the expiration of two months from the organization of the new Presbytery, these ministers shall not have made such application, or shall not have been received, their pastoral relations, so far as any may exist with the churches under our care, shall thenceforth be *ipso facto* dissolved.

Fourth. That the licentiates and candidates under the care of the dissolved Presbytery are hereby transferred to that now

constituted, and the Stated Clerk of the late Presbytery is hereby directed to place the records and other papers of the said Presbytery in the hands of the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery now constituted, as soon as such clerk shall be chosen.

Fifth. That this General Assembly, in thus dealing with a recusant and rebellious Presbytery, by virtue of the plenary authority existing in it for "suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations," has no intention or disposition to disturb the existing relation of churches, ruling elders, or private members, but rather to protect them in the enjoyment of their rights and privileges in the church of their choice, against men who would seduce them into an abandonment of the heritage of their fathers.

The committee recommend the adoption of the following order: That on the hearing of the matters presented by this report, the Commissioners to this Assembly from the Presbytery of Louisville be heard to the rules of order which govern this House. This recommendation was adopted, and the Rev. Dr. Brookes was requested to inform the Commissioners of the action of the Assembly. To this communication the following answer was received:

The undersigned, Commissioners from the Presbytery of Louisville, who happen not yet to have left the city—overlooking, in the spirit of Christian forbearance, the insult and seeming mockery of the Presbytery and themselves, in a proposition to appear and be heard before a court which has already condemned them unheard—in response to the resolution of this afternoon, transmitted to them by the Permanent Clerk of the General Assembly, most respectfully refer the Assembly to their letter of May 19th, as containing very obvious and sufficient reasons why they could not, without further special instructions from their Presbytery, appear before the present Assembly in any capacity.

SAMUEL R. WILSON,
STUART ROBINSON,
C. A. WICKLIFFE,
by James H. Brookes.

St. Louis, Mo., May 24th, 1866.

The debate on the above report of the Committee of seven was protracted and earnest. As the same principles were in-

volved, the discussion took much the same course as that which concerned the exclusion of the Commissioners of the Presbytery of Louisville. The first speaker was Dr. Thomas, who delivered a much more argumentative speech than the one on the former question. He contended, 1st. That the Louisville Presbytery was properly before the Assembly by the power of review and control. 2d. It is not necessary in order that the superior judicatory should exercise this right of review that the records should be before the House. It is enough that the irregularity to be corrected should be notorious. 3d. He appealed to former acts of the Assembly providing for the exclusion of delegates from offending Presbyteries, according to the rule in chap. v, section 9, of the *Book of Discipline*. 4th. He proved also that the Assembly had on other occasions passed over Synods, and acted immediately on Presbyteries. 5th. As the Assembly had the right to act in the way proposed, the occasion not only justified it, but demanded it.

H. K. Clarke, Esq., of Detroit, made a powerful speech in support of the report. In his introductory remarks he called attention to the fact that the executive, legislative, and judicial powers in our church courts were not distributed as in the state and national governments. They all vest in one and the same body. This of necessity creates a great difference as to the modes of procedure. After this and other preliminary observations he proceeded to discuss the following points: 1. Has the Assembly the power assumed in the report under consideration? He referred, in support of an affirmative answer to this question, to explicit statements of the *Form of Government*, in chaps. viii. and xii. In the exercise of this power the Assembly may adopt any mode of procedure in itself just, if it sees fit, provided no particular mode is prescribed in the constitution. No such mode is prescribed as to the conduct of process against a Presbytery. Hence the mode proposed in the report is perfectly legitimate. His second proposition was, that abundant ground was afforded in the action of the Presbytery of Louisville to call for the interference of the Assembly. That Presbytery deliberately refused to obey the injunctions of the Assembly of 1865, especially as to the reception of ministers and members who had participated in the rebellion. He argued

with great force to show that the rebellion was a great crime; that those who favoured and joined it were guilty of a civil, moral, and ecclesiastical offence; and that Presbyterian ministers and church members had been foremost in exciting and fostering this criminal revolt. He referred, in support of this last point, particularly to the action of the Synod of South Carolina, and to the sermon of Dr. Palmer, which had exerted so great an influence on the public mind at the South. The Presbytery had not only refused to obey the injunctions of the Assembly, but had avowed the purpose of creating a schism in the church, unless their opinions were adopted, and had taken measures to carry that purpose into effect.

Dr. West argued with ability and warmth on the same side, and with special reference to the speech of Dr. Van Dyke. He urged the adoption of the report for the following reasons.

(1.) Because the deliverances of the Assembly as to slavery and the rebellion are in accordance with God's word.

(2.) These injunctions are a duty, if the doctrines upon which they are based are true. We first give doctrine, and then enforce the precept. That is the rule in all our preaching. See the four preliminary principles in the *Form of Government*, where it is clearly laid down that truth and duty are inseparable.

(3.) The injunctions being true, remain until they are repealed, or the end for which they were given is accomplished.

(4.) The church is bound to state and enforce the truth on all subject to her care. There is no political element involved in this doctrine.

(5.) Because of the very end of government there must always be some final, ultimate tribunal, whose decrees are to be obeyed, unless contrary to the word of God.

(6.) Because the deliverances of the Assembly are in accordance with our standards; they are to be received and submitted to, as a power vested in the church for her good, and the good of her members. This power is not a self-originated, but a divinely delegated power—the power of Christ himself. The decrees of the Council of Jerusalem were not submitted to the Presbyteries; but they were binding then, and they are binding now. "But," says the objector, "those men were

apostles." I answer, that the apostleship was not a source of power, else there had been no need of a council.

(7.) Because our ordination vows bind us to submit to the General Assembly. We all understand this.

(8.) Upon the whole theory upon which the Presbyterian Church rests—its four grand principles, popularity, parity, &c.

(9.) From the principles laid down in the contest of 1838. All the questions involved here were settled then. How did that controversy terminate? It established the principle that the Assembly had legislative, executive, and judicial powers. This is the grand principle that runs all through that controversy.

He was particularly explicit as to the power of the Assembly in the premises. "We have no need," he said, "to wait for an express grant of power; for the relation of Presbyteries to the Assembly is not, by any means, the same as that of states to the general government. The power here is of God. The Assembly need not give a reason for its action, for it has all power. The question here is, Who is to be obeyed?—the Presbytery of Louisville, or the General Assembly? One or the other must give way. Our authority must be dragged down in disgrace, or punishment must be inflicted on the rebellious."

In an early part of this article, we adverted to the fact that Dr. West, in the Assembly of 1865 intimated in a very pointed manner, that if the injunction as to those who favoured the rebellion should be applied to the abettors of the rebellion at the North, it would not be obeyed. We had not then seen his speech, and therefore give here what he said on that point, as we find his remarks reported in the *Presbyterian*.

"It is alleged, again, that the Assembly refused to impose the same terms of admission upon men in the North, and men coming from the South. In reply to this I say, that the injunctions of the last Assembly were, that when application was made for admission, inquiries should be made as to the conduct of the applicant in the rebellion. An independent resolution was proposed, directing church sessions to take the same action, and make the same inquiries respecting their members. This,

as we all know, was voted down. The injunction made by the Assembly was left to be acted upon on *application.*"

We do not see that this touches one point. The question is. Have not our sessions and Presbyteries from God, and under our constitution, the right to judge of the qualifications of ministers and church members, subject of course to their responsibility in the exercise of that right, to the review of the higher judicatories? If the General Assembly has no right to say to the sessions, beforehand, whom they shall receive, and whom they shall reject, how can it have the right to say the same thing to the Presbyteries. And if abetting the rebellion be so great a crime as to call for the rejection of an applicant for admission, why does it not call for the expulsion of those already within our pale? If the injunctions of the Assembly be binding as to the southern applicants, it would have been equally binding as to the far more guilty northern abettors of the rebellion. And if the disobedience to the one injunction be a failure of allegiance to the church; then the contemptuous refusal to obey the other is a still greater offence against its authority. This is the light, as it seems to us, in which this matter will strike most minds.

Dr. William L. Breckinridge made the first speech in opposition to the report. The spirit which this gentleman brought into the debate may be inferred from the following paragraph:

"I have been taken to task a number of times since I had the privilege of addressing this body on this subject, by persons of various shades of opinion, and especially by those whom I would, without disrespect, call the holders of extreme opinions on this subject. I have been taken very gravely to task for the kindness of feeling I expressed towards my brethren on all sides; the effect of which, in my mind, is to convince me more and more that I am right. One finds very serious fault with me for speaking a single kind and loving word towards my brother Thomas, whom I have known longer probably than the person who rebuked me has lived; and another finds fault with me for speaking a kind or charitable word towards my dear brethren of the Declaration and Testimony wing, many of whom I have known for a long time. I am not in sympathy with either of these parties, but I thank God I can love them all as my

brethren, and when I am rebuked for expressing kindness of feeling towards them on both sides, I thank the Lord and take courage, because it convinces me more and more perfectly that the middle ground is the true ground."

The great object of his speech was to prove that the General Assembly had not the constitutional power to do what the committee recommended. It could not disregard the Synod, and reach over its head, and, of its own motion, either organize or dissolve a Presbytery. This he argued, 1. From the words of the constitution. In the chapter granting powers to the Assembly, there is not one word said of Presbyteries, except as they were the constituencies of the Assembly. 2. From the absence of any sustained decisions in support of such power. 3. From the evil consequences which would flow from its concession. If the Assembly can act directly on the Presbyteries, it may on the sessions, and on the individual members, and do anything that is "doable," having in itself all the power of the churches. From the reference made to this speech by subsequent speakers, it seems, not only on account of the character of the man, and spirit which he manifested, but by the force of the argument, to have made a strong impression upon the House.

Dr. Humphrey moved to strike out the resolutions reported by the committee, and insert the following:

Be it Resolved, as follows:

The "Declaration and Testimony" adopted and published by the Presbytery of Louisville is, in the terms, spirit, and intent thereof, derogatory to the just authority of the General Assembly, hostile to the institutions of this church, destructive to the peace of our people, and fruitful in schismatical contentions and disputations.

Wherefore this General Assembly expresses its grave disapprobation of the proceedings of the Presbytery, as unbecoming in a lower judicatory of the church.

The Assembly also enjoins upon the Presbytery to forbear whatever tends to further disturbances and agitations; to support the institutions of the church, and especially to take such order at its stated meeting as will show that it does not intend to defy the authority of the General Assembly, or to disparage the institutions of the church.

Furthermore, the Assembly does hereby require the Presbytery of Louisville to appear by its Commissioners before the next General Assembly, on the second day of its session, to show what it has done, or failed to do in these premises, and the next Assembly is requested to take up and issue this business.

Furthermore, the Assembly directs the other Presbyteries to confer with those ministers under their care, who have signed the "Declaration and Testimony," and to urge those brethren to disavow the intention of setting the authority of the General Assembly at defiance. These Presbyteries are also directed to report hereon in writing to the next Assembly. All this to the end that the whole church may have quietness and repose.

Notwithstanding the limited space at our command, we venture to insert the speech of *Dr. Humphrey*, in support of his substitute, at length as reported in the *Presbyterian*.

Mr. Moderator, allow me, in the first place, to speak of this question, not as it effects many of my brethren here; but as it affects the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky. While a large majority of you will return to undisturbed and pleasant fields of labour, and be allowed to prosecute your work in peace, we of the Synod of Kentucky will, if this paper is adopted, return, not to the ordinary and peaceful business of the ambassadors of Christ; but to scenes of strife and controversy, and to agitated and divided churches. We are thrust into the midst of a controversy in churches, among which some of us have gone forth for twenty years sowing the good seed of the kingdom, with God's blessing upon our labours. Therefore bear with us while we present our views as to the effect of the measure proposed by this report. And let me say just here, that whatever may be your action, some of us will bow in due and respectful deference, and go home to do what we can to repair the desolations around us. If it were the purpose of the Assembly to exact strict *justice*—if no *mercy* were to be exercised—undoubtedly it might be well to pass the paper before us. But if it is our purpose to exercise mercy, tempered with judgment, this is not the paper. I sympathize fully with the sentiment expressed by a previous speaker, and thank God that he *is* a God of mercy.

This is my only ground for hope; and it is in this spirit that I have drawn the paper I have just presented.

Let me now call the attention of the Assembly to some points wherein this amendment differs from the report of the committee. And, in the first place, let me say that, as respects the Declaration and Testimony, and the judgment we form of it, there is no essential difference between this paper and that of the committee. Stronger terms are used by the committee, it is true; but the opinion expressed is substantially the same. There are in Kentucky three parties; first, the signers and supporters of the Declaration and Testimony; second, the "middle men," as they are called; and third the party representing the majority of this Assembly. We, who are known as "middle men," agree with the latter in their opinion of that pamphlet. So far as the church is concerned, we agree that whatever there is in it that is new, is not true; and that what is true, is not new. As to secular and spiritual affairs, we believe that things secular belong to the state; and things spiritual, to the church; but we hold also, that in the rebellion great moral questions were involved, and we thank God for the deliverances of the Assembly during the last few years. While I have not agreed to some of the great points in those deliverances, and have thought them not strictly in accordance with the principles by which such matters should be settled, I have stood by the church, and I expect to do so in the future, for I believe the great body of its testimony is deduced from the word of God. As to the *spirit* of the Declaration and Testimony, I suppose, therefore that we are in entire accordance with this body. Sir, until I read it, I did not know how rich the English language was in terms of objurgation—they dance through the whole document to the tune of Dixie. I agree with the Assembly that the *spirit* of this document must be rebuked. But when I come to compare the two modes proposed for this purpose, I find that the one proposed by the committee is *partial.* It is to be brought to bear in all its terrible power upon the heads of a few brethren in the Presbytery of Louisville, while there are others who confess themselves guilty of the same offence. Is there any good reason why the whole power of the Assembly should fall upon a few, while others are allowed to

escape? There is undoubtedly a difference between the Presbytery of Louisville and others, and this amendment provides for that difference. It proposes to deal differently with different offenders—to *deal* with all, but with a difference in our final judgment.

When the life, the liberty, or the ecclesiastical relations of the people of God are at stake, judicial forms are of vast importance. This amendment preserves the form of judicial process. I have been pained to hear it asserted here that it is unnecessary to regard the *form* so long as we observe the *spirit* of the law. Why, Moderator, forms but embody the spirit. You cannot trample down the form without trampling upon the spirit. We must stand by the *form* if we would preserve the *spirit* of justice. The plan proposed by the committee is anomalous and unprecedented. What analogy, I ask, is there between the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia and the Presbytery of Louisville? The former was established without constitutional authority, and for the propagation of error. It was dissolved because it never had a legal existence. The latter was established in 1813, and from that day has stood on the firm foundations of the church. Did any one ever hear of a Presbytery dissolved, and its members turned out of the church in the manner in which it is proposed to dispose of the Presbytery of Louisville? The ecclesiastical position of every minister in the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia was carefully cared and provided for, while here a Presbytery is dissolved, and no provision is made to preserve the ecclesiastical position of its members. Our fathers in 1837 were remarkably careful to administer matters according to the constitution of the church, and they ceased their citation only because the dissolution of the Plan of Union made it unnecessary. Did you ever know of a body of men turned out of the church—and that, too, without a hearing? Festus said it was not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he who is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him. Shall we be less just than they? All through our Book citation is the rule—aye, *two* citations—for proceeding against offenders; and I undertake to say you cannot proceed to this measure till you have

given these brethren a fair chance; and that they may have that, this amendment proposes to cite them to appear before the next Assembly.

Again. The process recommended by the committee is *too summary*. It does not afford to these brethren that *locus penitentiæ*—that place for repentance—which is guarantied to the worst criminals. Hence I plead for more time. Give them one year more. If they bring forth fruit, well; if not, then cut them down. We propose by this amendment to put this case on such a footing that a judicial trial and investigation can be had hereafter. I have quite agreed with my venerable colleague (Dr. R. J. Breckinridge) that a judicial trial was the best way to settle this important matter, and we came here expecting it, under his appeal. Here is a legal tribunal; here are the parties; here are the judges, who have come, expecting to hear and consider the matter; here is the venerable Nestor, whose breast has so long been bared to the enemies of his church and of his God; here are the papers; here are all things necessary for a full and impartial investigation. We expected this course to be pursued. We came ready to submit to your decisions, whatever they might be, and to go back to Kentucky and stand by the church, though we went back under your censure, and marked with tokens of your disapprobation. That plan has failed, and we now propose to cite these brethren before the next Assembly, and to settle this great case, not upon the banks of the turbid Mississippi, but beside the clear and beautiful waters of the Ohio.

Again. The scheme proposed by the committee is simply one of *church power*. It is a *brutem fulmen* in every aspect. It says to these men, "We have concentrated in our hands *all* the power which Christ has given to his church. We have you in our hands, and will hold you there, and in the exercise of this concentrated power." The amendment proposes that our proceedings shall be in the legitimate exercise of the power of all the bodies among which the power of the church is distributed. We urge a trial. We urge that the question may come up by a reference to the Synod of Kentucky. I believe that Synod would issue the matter in accordance with truth and righteousness, and I do not object to the insertion of such an injunction.

This Declaration and Testimony was only issued in September last. Give us time to deal with these brethren, and see if they will not retrace their steps. We are greatly agitated and disturbed all over Kentucky, and we ask this General Assembly now to step in and relieve us. If you will send this case back to us, we will do the very best we can with it. I beg of you to consider all these things, and act accordingly.

I now approach a point upon which I speak with diffidence and reluctance. Though I have lived there for twenty years, I am not a Kentuckian by birth, and I can say here what I would not say before a Kentucky Presbytery. I tell you these Kentuckians are a great people. Kentucky has been the cradle of Presbyterianism for all these western and south-western states. She has had a bloody and troubled history, and a troubled experience in religious matters. First came the Cumberland schism, then the New-light controversy, and then the New-school agitation and division. Our cause has triumphed there in three trying conflicts. We are now in the midst of a fourth, and, by God's blessing and your assistance, we will meet it successfully. But do not lay upon us burdens which we cannot bear. Kentucky has always had an able and godly ministry—men of ardent zeal and untiring labour—yet to-day the Presbyterian Church within her bounds numbers but ten thousand communicants. Kentucky Presbyterianism has emptied itself all over Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Tennessee, and been a fountain of light and salvation all over this land. Yet, few as we are in numbers, we have done some things for Christ and for his church. We have established two noble institutions. Danville College and Danville Seminary stand to-day as monuments of the piety and liberality of Kentucky Presbyterianism. Of our one hundred and fifty churches, but one-third are self-sustaining. If you drive a ploughshare through these churches, what can be the result but to ruin all this work of years, and spread division and desolation through all our bounds? Now, unless it is absolutely necessary, lay not on us this severe affliction. Spare us one year more to go back to our brethren of the Declaration and Testimony, and beseech them to cease from this work of strife. Let our Kentucky church alone one year more, I entreat you. Then, if you *must* cut it down, well.

We will submit, and, though with bleeding hearts, we will go home and labour to repair our desolations. You who are pastors, we entreat you to come to us as pastors. We call upon you who are young men, to come to us in the name and spirit of the Master, and labour with us for the strengthening and establishment of his glorious kingdom. We call upon you to come and preach the gospel. But spare us this blow—*spare us this blow.* Do not destroy forever our hopes of a united church.

We learn from the papers that the delivery of this speech drew tears from many of the audience. Elder H. K. Clarke Esq., said, "It almost persuaded him to be—on Dr. Humphrey's side." Had the Dr's substitute been adopted, we believe that it would have been as oil on troubled waters, and ultimately satisfied all parts of the church, except perhaps the most extreme of the Declaration and Testimony men. It has been ordered otherwise. God, for his own wise purposes, seems to have ordained a further period of agitation and trial for the church, for its good and his own glory.

Dr. Van Dyke spoke at length against the report of the committee. Few members of the Assembly, on either side of the House, were listened to with greater respect by all parties. His moderation and manliness, as well as the clearness and fervor of his arguments, produced a strong impression whenever he addressed the Assembly. His speech has been published in a separate form, as well as reported in the papers. We can give only a bare synopsis of its principal points. 1. He laid down what he claimed to be the true principles of loyalty in the church and state. He had been loyal in both relations. He had no intention of separating himself from the church of his fathers. 2. He denied that the signers of the Declaration and Testimony had any design to divide the church. 3. He reviewed the action of the late Assemblies, particularly that of 1864, to show that it was political in its character and bearing. 4. He maintained that the decrees of the Assembly of 1865 were unconstitutional, and therefore not binding on anybody. The Assembly had only delegated powers, and cannot make terms of communion without transmitting them to the Presbyteries for their approval. 4. The proposed action was partial.

"Why this discrimination," he asked, "between ministers of different sections? There are ministers in all the Presbyteries,—and I am one of them—who will not obey them. The Synod of New Jersey and other judicatories have formally protested against them. 5. "The execution of these orders is impossible. Not a Synod nor a Presbytery in the North has tried to enforce them. I abominated," he said, "the effort to enforce on men who are *down*, and who owned themselves 'whipped,' orders which I do not dare to enforce on my own members."

Dr. Boardman made a long and able argument on the same side of the question. 1. He expressed decided disapprobation of the Declaration and Testimony. He regarded it as urging sound Scripture principles to an undue extent. He did not believe that there were five men in that Assembly who do not believe a large part of the principles laid down in that paper. He contended therefore, that as its signers were not heretical, as they were devoted ministers of the gospel, they did not deserve the severe treatment now proposed. 2. He urged that the Assembly have not acted with such severity towards other offenders. He read extracts from the *Danville Review* condemning the action of the Assembly as "unchristian and unjust." 3. He argued to show that the decrees of 1865 were unconstitutional. "You require," he said, "of every minister from the South who presents himself for admission, that he holds to the opinions of the four last Assemblies on the subject of slavery; and this too, when your own Assembly has said it is wrong to make slaveholding a term of communion." 4. He depicted at length the evil consequences which may be expected to flow from the proposed action.

Dr. Brookes, from his high standing as a man and as a minister, and his distinguished ability as a public speaker, secured an attentive hearing from the house, and was sustained by the sympathy of a crowded audience in the galleries. He said he stood alone. Even those who were most opposed to the action of the majority joined in the condemnation of the Declaration and Testimony. As he had signed that document, and, although not its author, had been principally instrumental in its production, he was the more bound to speak in its

defence. He regarded the Declaration and Testimony as a simple protest, and he does not appear to have assumed its defence in any other light. His first position was, that there was good and sufficient reason for protesting against the acts of the five preceding Assemblies. In support of this position, he cited the testimony of Dr. Hodge and others, who had protested against the action of the Assembly of 1861; and then that of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, Dr. W. C. Matthews, Dr. R. W. Landis, and Dr. Humphrey, who had joined in the condemnation of that action in terms as severe as those used in the Declaration and Testimony. 2. He reviewed the acts of subsequent Assemblies, passing slightly over those of 1862 and 1863, and dwelling at length on the action of the Assembly of 1864, in reference to slavery. That action was, as he maintained, in direct contradiction to the carefully considered deliverance of the Assembly of 1845, and to the word of God. In 1845 the Assembly declared that slaveholding was not in itself sinful, nor was the renunciation of that relation a condition of membership in the church of Christ. The Assembly of 1864 declares it to be "guilt" and "sin." It instructs the Board of Domestic Missions to refuse its aid to all missionaries and ministers who do not adhere to the declaration of that Assembly, touching loyalty and slavery. The Assembly of 1865 reduced the principles of the former Assemblies to practice, by enjoining on the lower judicatories to require of applicants for admission, the adoption of those principles. This, he said, necessitated a struggle unless "the liberty of God's children, and the crown rights of Jesus Christ as King of Zion were to be tamely and basely surrendered."

His second position, viz., the right of any member of the church to protest, not being called in question, was not enlarged upon. The third point of his argument was, that the spirit and form of the protest contained in the Declaration and Testimony were justified by the necessities of the case. He asserted that the committee who had that document under consideration had failed to produce anything really disrespectful to the Assembly. He instituted an extended comparison between the spirit and language of the Declaration and Testimony and those of protests uttered on other occasions. Under this head he referred to the

paper prepared by Dr. W. L. Breckinridge, and adopted by the Presbytery of Translyvania, declaring certain acts of the Assembly of 1865 unconstitutional, unwise, inexpedient, and nugatory. He cited still stronger language from the records of the Presbyteries of Ebenezer, of Sangamon, (Ill.) and Lewes, (Md.) He dwelt on the action of the Synod of Kentucky, in the fall of 1865, sustained by the vote of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, which declared "the acts of last General Assembly, (1865), on overtures No. 6 and 7, and the fourth resolution on the Report of the Board of Domestic Missions, in the judgment of the Synod, unwise, as tending to destroy the peace and harmony of the church, and in some of their provisions unconstitutional and unscriptural." Dr. Brookes then adverted to earlier facts in our history. He cited the action of the Presbytery of Chillicothe, which declared they could hold no communion with any ecclesiastical body which tolerated the sin of slaveholding, or its justification, under its jurisdiction. He quoted from the *Christian Monthly Magazine*, for Sept. 1845, edited by the Rev. Dr. Thomas, an extremely severe denunciation of the Assembly of that year, for its deliverance on slavery. He thus endeavoured to show that there was nothing in the Declaration and Testimony to call for special censure from the General Assembly.

Besides the substitute for the Report of the Committee presented by Dr. Humphrey, printed above, *Dr. Boardman* offered the following paper:

The attention of the General Assembly has been called to a pamphlet entitled 'A Declaration and Testimony,' purporting to have been adopted by the Presbytery of Louisville, on the 2d day of Sept. 1865. This pamphlet contains various statements, which, if taken in their literal import, we regard as disrespectful to the General Assembly, pregnant with schism, and adapted to foster a spirit of insubordination throughout our bounds. The Assembly is unwilling to believe that the Presbytery of Louisville designed to place itself in an attitude of rebellion against the just authority which Christ has established in his church, or that it will deliberately sanction the use of words and phrases which seem to set at defiance the higher judicatories of the church. Willing to give the members of that Pres-

bytery time for reflection, the Assembly contents itself, for the present, with admonishing them of their grievous error, and directing them to review their whole procedure in this matter, and to make a full report of their action in the premises to the Synod of Kentucky, at its next stated session, and also to the next General Assembly.

The Synod of Kentucky is instructed to take such order in the case as may, in their judgment, best conduce to the purity and harmony of the church, and the interests of true religion. And since this case has manifestly excited much feeling, and threatens to disturb still further the peace of our communion, we exhort all concerned to cultivate a spirit of forbearance and conciliation, to merge all private and personal aims in a paramount devotion to the interests of truth and righteousness, and humbly invoke for themselves and the churches with which they are connected the healing, reviving, and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit.

Preferred by

H. A. Boardman,
R. W. Allen,
J. S. McClellan,
D. C. Brown,
John H. Clarke,
Justus T. Umsted,
I. F. Vanarsdale.
R. J. Clark,
Joseph T. Smith,
J. E. Spilman,
Charles A. Marshall,
William T. Adams,
William M. Grimes,

H. Day, Esq., of New York, offered the following substitute for the paper of Dr. Gurley, subsequently adopted by the House:

Whereas, This General Assembly has had brought to its notice a certain paper called a "Declaration and Testimony," which, it is alleged, was adopted by the Louisville Presbytery, Sept. 2, 1865, and which imports to be signed by ministers and ruling elders belonging to other Presbyteries; and, whereas, in the judgment of this General Assembly, the said paper is a most flagrant and unwarranted attack on the dignity and authority of the General Assembly, derogatory to its character, tending to bring odium and disrepute on the highest judicatory of the church, and to increase agitation and alienation in the bosom of the church, schismatical in effect, contumacious in

spirit, and unjust and untrue in its statements; now, therefore this General Assembly, in defence of its authority, in the exercise of its high prerogative to suppress schismatical contentions and disputations, reproving, warning, and bearing testimony against error in doctrine and immorality in practice, and in the fulfilment of its sacred duty to secure union, peace, and mutual confidence of all our churches, does *Resolve*,

1. That this General Assembly considers the alleged action of the Louisville Presbytery, and of the ministers and ruling elders who have signed, published, and disseminated the said paper called the "Declaration and Testimony," as worthy of the gravest censure of this body, and as an offence against the authority, peace, and harmony of the church, and as a sin against the Lord Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Church.

2. That the Synod of Kentucky is hereby required, at its next meeting, to proceed in an orderly manner to try the Louisville Presbytery for the said alleged offence of adopting, publishing, and disseminating, the said "Declaration and Testimony," and that the Synod by its records, at the next General Assembly, do show what it has done in the premises.

3. That this Assembly does hereby require and enjoin on the said Louisville Presbytery, to reconsider its action in adopting said "Declaration and Testimony," to cease from disseminating the same, and from all agitations and contentions which tend to disturb the peace and harmony of the church, and to submit to the lawful authority of the church of Christ, as exercised by the General Assembly, and that the Presbytery by its Commissioners report its action in the premises to the next General Assembly.

4. That each and all the Presbyteries with whom any of the subscribers to said Declaration and Testimony are connected, are hereby required, at their next meeting, to proceed against such subscribers, and try them for said alleged acts, in signing and giving publicity to said document, and if it is found that they have been guilty of offence in so doing, that each of said Presbyteries, respectively, do censure their conduct, and require such members to confess their error, and to cease from their agitations; and such Presbyteries are hereby required, by their Commissioners, to appear at the next General Assembly, and

report their action in the premises, and while such persons are under process, as aforesaid, to suspend their privilege of deliberating and voting as members, until the process is finally issued; and it is further ordered, that the members of said Presbyteries, who have not subscribed said "Declaration and Testimony," shall have the authority of such Presbyteries respectively, shall exercise their proper functions, and shall have charge of the Presbyterial Records and all property.

Mr. Day's motion was laid upon the table.

Under a subsequent resolution of the Assembly, it was signed by the following persons, as expressing their views, and being the one for which they would have voted had it come before the Assembly:

Henry Day, A. Gosman, S. G. Law, E. D. Yeomans, E. B. Raffensperger, W. T. Cushing, D. V. Smock, D. M. Halliday, John Dickson, John M. Krebs, William H. Hornblower, S. D. Chamberlin, J. R. Ralph, John L. Nevius, H. L. Vannuys.

Dr. Gurley's paper, which was presented as a substitute for the resolution recommended by the Committee, was adopted by the vote, *yeas*, 196; *nays*, 37. *Declined to vote*, J. H. Brookes, 1. The paper is as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That this General Assembly does hereby condemn the Declaration and Testimony, as a slander against the church, schismatical in its character and aims, and its adoption by any of our church courts as an act of rebellion against the authority of the General Assembly.

2. *Resolved*, That the whole subject contemplated in this report, including the report itself, be referred to the next General Assembly.

3. *Resolved*, That the signers of the "Declaration and Testimony," and the members of the Presbytery of Louisville who voted to adopt that paper, be summoned, and they are hereby summoned, to appear before the next General Assembly, to answer for what they have done in this matter, and that until their case is decided, they shall not be permitted to sit as members of any church court higher than the Session.

4. *Resolved*, That if any Presbytery shall disregard this action of the General Assembly, and at any meeting shall enroll, as entitled to a seat or seats in the body, one or more of

the persons designated in the preceding resolution and summoned to appear before the next General Assembly, then that Presbytery shall *ipso facto* be dissolved, and its ministers and elders who adhere to this action of the Assembly, are hereby authorized and directed, in such cases, to take charge of the Presbyterial Records, to retain the name, and exercise all the authority and functions of the original Presbytery, until the next meeting of the General Assembly.

5. *Resolved*, That Synods, at their next stated meetings, in making up their rolls, shall be guided and governed by this action of the General Assembly.

In support of this paper, Dr. Gurley read the following reasons for adopting it, which were ordered by the Assembly to be inserted with it in the *Minutes*.

1. Because it condemns in strong, yet just and appropriate terms, the Declaration and Testimony, pronouncing it "a slander against the church, schismatical in its character and aims," which it manifestly is.

2. Because it declares the adoption of the Declaration and Testimony by any of our church courts, to be an act of rebellion against the authority of the General Assembly; which it manifestly is.

3. Because it summons the signers of this Declaration and the members of the Presbytery of Louisville who voted for its adoption, to appear and answer for their conduct before the General Assembly, the body against whom they have offended, and the only body which, in the present circumstances of the church, can properly and without embarrassment consider and adjudicate the case.

4. Because it summons them to appear before the *next* Assembly, thus giving them ample time for reflection, for repentance, and for making up their reply.

5. Because, in the meantime, it forbids their sitting in any church court higher than the Session—an abridgment of privilege which we are bound to make in fidelity to our erring brethren and to the peace of the church.

6. Because it saves us from even the appearance of taking action in this case which is too summary and severe. Though we might lawfully dissolve the Presbytery of Louisville at this

time, no such great or perilous exigency has arrived as makes such an extraordinary proceeding necessary—nor is it expedient. It is better for the Assembly, better for the church, and better for all the interests in any way concerned in this case, that justice should be secured and administered *in the ordinary way and by the ordinary methods.*

7. I urge the adoption of this substitute, because it provides that in case any Presbytery shall disregard this action of the Assembly, and permit the signers of the Declaration and Testimony or those who voted to approve it, to sit in the body as members, that act of rebellion, according to an authoritative declaration of the Assembly, dissolves the Presbytery, and causes its powers to pass at once into the hands of those who respect the highest court of the church, and are willing to submit to its authority.

8. Finally, in answer to the objection, that the General Assembly has no right to pass beyond the lower courts and deal with individuals, I would say, our *Form of Government* expressly gives to the General Assembly the power "of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations;" and this clearly implies the power of dealing directly with the persons or parties who are engaged in such contentions and disputations.

Dr. Monfort moved that it be the sense of the Assembly that the above paper take effect at the close of the sessions of this Assembly, and that the signers of the "Declaration and Testimony" continue until then to occupy their seats.

This paper of Dr. Gurley has some obvious advantages over that proposed by Dr. D. V. McLean. It avoids immediate and peremptory action; it gives time for those implicated to consider and determine upon the course which they will pursue; and it secured the votes of some who doubted the authority of the Assembly to act at once and without citation or warning, on a Presbytery, without regard to the Synod to which it belonged. On the other hand, it goes quite as far as the report of the committee, as to the power which it assumes to belong to the General Assembly; it is equally severe in the penalty attached to adherence to the Declaration and Testimony; and it reaches over the whole church, instead of being confined to the single Presbytery of Louisville. The Presbytery of Baltimore, we

understand, has one member, a young gentleman from Canada or Nova Scotia, who signed the Declaration and Testimony. If the Presbytery should allow him to take his seat, it would be *ipso facto* dissolved. The Assembly thus proposes to visit scruples as to the constitutionality of one of its injunctions and a simple act of disobedience, with a penalty as severe as it could inflict for the open denial of Christ and rejection of his gospel. We do not question the right of the Assembly to pass such an order. We speak only of the severity of the penalty. We think that the Presbyteries ought to submit to this order, however severe they may consider it. For ourselves, we should, on the whole, have preferred, of the two papers, the resolutions of the Committee.

In the winding up of the Assembly there were several papers of importance adopted.

First: The following addition to the Pastoral Letter, proposed by Dr. Krebs.

In regard to the deliverances of the last and five preceding Assemblies, as well as this, and especially the requisitions to examine applicants from the South touching their views of slavery and rebellion, the Assembly would observe, that although the war is over, secession effectively quashed, and slavery abolished,—yet in view of the spirit of these dead issues which, it must be admitted, still survives rampant and rebellious, perhaps more virulently in the religious form than elsewhere, it was necessary to guard the church from being disturbed by this element, which has asserted itself so rebelliously, and continues to be so vehemently proclaimed, and therefore to require satisfactory evidence of the practical repudiation of these heresies.

Nor does the Assembly deem it needless to observe, that while manifestly the views put forth by these deliverances, and the views which it was proposed to elicit from applicants for admission to our churches and presbyteries, have regard only to those more recent opinions concerning the system of Southern slavery, out of which secession and the war for its perpetuation and extension grew, the Assembly considers that there is no contradiction between these latest expressions of the Assembly, needed by a new state of the case, and the whole current of consistent deliverances on the subject of slavery which the church has

from the beginning and all along uttered—especially from 1818 to 1846.

The Assembly in these things has desired to impose no new terms of communion; it has but pointed out the appropriate treatment of the rebellious and disobedient; and, in the language of no less an authority than the illustrious Calvin, it did but make "a genuine and simple application of the *lex Dei* to the times and manners for which it was designed." In this special application it has only, in the still further language of the great Reformer, "guarded against offences which are most expressly forbidden by the Lord," without, "taking away one *punctum* of Christian liberty." *Instit.*, lib. iv., cap. x., sec iv. 21, 22.

And in regard to our deliverances on these subjects, the Assembly here contents itself, as sufficient, with declaring that it has but exercised the constitutional right and duty of the Assembly, which has been constantly exercised from the time of the fathers who made the constitution of our church, to utter its sentiments, warnings, and exhortations, on all points and questions, which, while we are properly restrained from invading the jurisdiction of civil tribunals, do nevertheless belong to that class of things which we may handle, viz., those moral and religious questions, which, although they may even embrace points in which *politics*, whether in their larger or lesser sense, are involved, because they relate to civil and political affairs, are also questions of *religious* duty, and cannot be thrown out of the religious jurisdiction.

Second: Dr. Gurley offered the following addition, which was also adopted:

It having come to the knowledge of this body that some of the ministers under our care are not able to subscribe to the recent testimonies of the General Assembly on the subjects of loyalty and freedom, and that some who have not signed or formally approved the Declaration and Testimony, do nevertheless hesitate to comply with the requirements of the last Assembly touching the reception of members from the South, known or supposed to have been in sympathy with the rebellion; therefore,

Resolved, That while we would treat such ministers with

kindness and forbearance, and would by no means interfere with the full and free discussion on their part of the testimonies and requirements referred to, we deem it a solemn duty, which we owe to them and to the church, to guard them against giving countenance in any way to declarations and movements which are defiant of the Assembly's authority, and schismatical in their tendency and aim, and we do earnestly exhort them in the name and for the sake of our common Lord and Master, to study and pursue the things which make for peace.

Third: Dr. *W. E. Schenck* offered the following paper:

Whereas, There is reason to believe that among the ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church in the South, there are many who disapproved of the late rebellion against the Government of the United States and of the separation of those churches from this body, and who did not of their own free will and consent lend their aid or countenance thereto, but bowed, before what they believed to be an irresistible necessity; therefore

Resolved, That this Assembly, without expressing any opinion in regard to the propriety of the course adopted by such persons, will still cherish a kindly and fraternal regard for them, and whenever any of them shall desire to return to their former connection with us, they will receive a cordial welcome.

And in regard to those who have voluntarily aided and countenanced the said rebellion and separation, this Assembly disclaims all vindictive feelings, and all disposition to exercise an undue severity, and reiterates its readiness to receive them back whenever they shall have complied with the conditions laid down by the last General Assembly on page 563 of its printed *Minutes*.

After discussion, the previous question was called for and sustained, when the main question was put, and the paper was adopted.

Fourth: A paper offered by Dr. *J. T. Smith*, was, on motion, taken from the table and adopted. It is as follows:

Whereas, The churches in that portion of our country lately in rebellion, whose names appear upon our roll, have not been represented in this Assembly, and still remain in a state of separation from us; *and whereas*, the measures adopted by this Assembly, if not carried out by the lower courts in a spirit of

great meekness and forbearance, may result in perpetuating and embittering divisions already existing, and extending them over portions of our church, now at peace; therefore,

Resolved, 1. That this Assembly greatly deplores the continued separation between ourselves and our Southern brethren, so long united in the bonds of Christian love and ecclesiastical fellowship, and expresses the earnest desire that the way may be soon opened for a reunion on the basis of our common standards, and on terms consistent with truth and righteousness.

Resolved, 2. That the lower courts who may be called upon to execute the measures of this Assembly, be enjoined to proceed therein with great meekness and forbearance, and in a spirit of kindness and conciliation, to the end that strifes and divisions be not multiplied and inflamed, and extended still more widely, and that the discipline of Christ's house may prove for edification and not for destruction.

The matter of a report from Dr. West, on the Sunday milk traffic, committed to him by the last General Assembly, was referred to the next Assembly.

Fifth: Dr. Lowrie, from the Committee on Overtures, presented a report in answer to the memorial of the Convention from which the following paragraph is an extract:

"As the General Assembly, at its present session, has considered substantially the matters embraced in said memorial, and expressed by its action its judgment, it is deemed unnecessary to suggest any additional measure for rebuking the spirit of rebellion against the authority of our highest court in a few sections of our church. The dissatisfaction and discontent consequent upon the deliverances of the Assembly of 1865 are abating with increased knowledge of the design and purport of those decisions, and it is confidently believed that maturer reflection will produce a fuller acquiescence in the authority of the church. It is alike the past and present purpose of our church, to preserve within its fold all who sincerely and earnestly love its order and doctrines, and to fan into life and energy every lingering spark of genuine attachment to our faith and order which may exist in those portions of our country where the spirit and unrelenting power of the rebellion drove many true and loyal Presbyterians into a hostile atti-

tude towards the church and country. With this enlarged and Christian view, it is appropriate to declare, that whilst the testimonies and authority of our church are to be obeyed, the fullest Christian liberty of opinion is tolerated and protected, and no enforcement of the deliverances of our church is expected or demanded—except that which will debar from our communion and church courts all those who refuse to submit to the 'powers that be,' and remain in wilful antagonism to the manifestations of God's providence, and the authoritative decisions of our church."

Every attentive reader of the minutes and reported debates of the last Assembly must be aware that in all that concerns the action of the Assembly in regard to the Presbytery of Louisville and its Commissioners, there are three distinct points for consideration. First, had the Assembly the constitutional right to exclude these Commissioners from a seat in the Assembly until their case was decided; and had it the right to dissolve that Presbytery as was proposed by the Committee; or to dissolve other Presbyteries on the contingency provided for in the paper of Dr. Gurley, which was finally adopted? The second question is, assuming that the Assembly had the right to do what it did, was there any sufficient reason for its action? Did the Presbytery of Louisville merit exclusion from the Assembly? The third question relates to the manner in which these things were done. There may be a right and wrong, a kind or unkind, a fair or unfair way of doing what in itself is just and proper.

The first of these questions alone has any permanent importance. It is comparatively a small matter that a court should inflict an unduly severe penalty; or that the judge should be harsh and overbearing in his spirit and manner, provided he has the law on his side. It was not the hardship to Dred Scott, as a man, or any want of courtesy on the part of the Supreme Court, that caused its decision in that case to shake the country like an earthquake. It was that the decision itself was in conflict with the long-cherished and settled convictions of the people as to what was the true law of the land. As to the first of the three questions proposed for consideration, it may

be remarked that there are three different theories as to the nature of our Presbyterian system; all of which were advanced on the floor of the late Assembly, and each of which controlled the opinions and votes of those who adopted it.

The first is derived very much (as it seems to us) from an assumed analogy between the constitution of the United States and that of the church. In our national and state governments, the constitution is a grant of powers. Congress has no power which is not specified in the constitution; all others are expressly reserved to the states or to the people. In like manner, as many assume, the Presbyteries are the source of power in the church. The Assembly has no power not expressly granted by the Presbyteries in the constitution. And hence the demand was so frequently and earnestly made for a reference to chapter and section, where the power to exclude Commissioners, or to act immediately on a Presbytery, was granted.

The second theory goes to the opposite extreme. It assumes that the Assembly is the source of power to the other courts. Having all church-power in itself, it has delegated a certain portion of its fulness to Synods, Presbyteries, and Sessions. This was the doctrine for which the authority of Chief Justice Gibson, and of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania was quoted, especially by Hon. Mr. Galloway. A much higher authority might have been derived from the Church of Scotland.

The third view is that which, we presume, is held by the great body of Presbyterians. It assumes, 1. That all church power is derived from Christ and conveyed in his word, and by his Spirit. 2. That this power belongs to the whole church, not to the clergy to the exclusion of the people, nor to the people to the exclusion of the clergy. 3. That it inheres in the church, as the body of Christ, and, by his appointment, is to be exercised through certain office-bearers, who act as its representatives and organs. 4. These office-bearers are selected, qualified, and called by the Holy Spirit. 5. It is the function of the church to authenticate this call of the Spirit, and to certify it as its judgment, to the people. This is done in ordination. 6. The office-bearers of a church, therefore, are that church, *i. e.*, they are authorized and empowered, in the name and behalf of the church to exercise all the power which Christ has given

it for edification. Hence the session of an individual church is authorized to do whatever an individual church may do, in the reception of members, in the exercise of discipline, and in the instruction and spiritual nurture of the people. So the Presbytery is vested with the power of the church within its limits. It is the representative, organ, and agent of the collective body of Christ's people included within its ecclesiastical limits. The same is true of Synods, Assemblies, or other general councils. These church courts in no case derive their powers from the constitution. They possessed them before the constitution was framed, and would continue to possess them although it was entirely abolished. A number of Christians organizing themselves into a church, and electing church officers, would of course have the power which Christ has given to his church: the power to judge of the qualifications of candidates for admission to Christian ordinances; to exercise discipline, and to provide for the edification of the people. The Presbytery has, in like manner, independently of any written or human constitution, all the power which Christ has given to a Presbytery,—the right to ordain, the right to suspend and depose from the sacred ministry; and the right to exercise all the functions of a church within its own limits. The constitution is only a treaty, or a set of stipulations, as to how these several church courts shall exercise the powers which they derive from Christ. The Presbytery, for example, has the right to ordain, but it has agreed with other Presbyteries not to ordain any candidate who has not received a classical education. That is, as the Scriptures require that a minister must be apt to teach, the Presbyteries have bound themselves to regard a liberal education as one evidence that the candidate possesses that qualification. Again, the Bible requires that a minister should be sound in the faith, able to resist gainsayers; the Presbyteries have agreed to make the sincere adoption of the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession a test of such soundness. The constitution therefore, instead of being a grant of powers, is a limitation of them, so far as their exercise is concerned. It ties the hands of all the church courts, and prevents their doing many things which otherwise they would have a perfect right to do. All this is reasonable and just. It is necessary to

secure harmony, peace, and purity. If one Presbytery assumed one standard of ability to teach, or soundness in the faith, and another another; the utmost confusion and conflict would be produced. Besides, a minister ordained by one Presbytery becomes a minister of the whole church, and exercises in the higher courts a jurisdiction over the whole body. The whole body, therefore, has an interest in his being suitably qualified, and a right to a voice in securing that end.

According to this theory every church court has within its limits all church power. The power of presbyters is given to presbyters, inheres in them, and is not delegated to them. It can be exercised by them, whenever they are properly associated and organized for the exercise of their functions. A commander-in-chief of an army can command a regiment or a company. In cases of emergency he does assume such command. It is only on rare occasions that this is either expedient or possible. He has too much to do, to allow of his taking into his own hands the duties of his subordinates. In the state, the care of children is properly left to their own parents. But in the case of orphans, or when the parents are untrustworthy, the courts interfere, and the children become wards in chancery. The court performs toward them the duty of parents. Our General Assembly has examined a minister on his knowledge of experimental religion, and his qualifications for the sacred office, and received him as a minister of the Presbyterian Church, in good standing. Of course the cases are extremely rare in which the higher courts are justified in assuming the functions of the lower bodies, but, so far as the power to do so is concerned, we do not see how it can be questioned. If three presbyters have from God the right to ordain or depose, why should not three hundred have the same power? Our church in the early period of its history uniformly acted on this principle. When the original Presbytery passed into a Synod, the Synod continued to exercise presbyterial powers, in appointing commissions to license, to ordain, to visit churches, and to adjust difficulties.

Such being the nature of the power of our church courts, it is necessary to consider its limitations. The power of all our courts is limited in three ways: First, it extends only to things

ecclesiastical, to the exclusion of secular affairs. Secondly, it is limited by the constitution. Thirdly, it is limited by the word of God.

1. The church has authority only in matters pertaining to religion. It is organized and endowed by her Head with certain prerogatives in order to secure the propagation and preservation of the gospel, the purity and edification of the body of Christ. If Congress should pass laws to regulate the religion of the country, they would be a dead letter. If church courts transcend their limits, and undertake to decide questions pertaining to the state and its civil tribunals, their decisions have no binding force. The church cannot regulate the tariff, or establish banks, or make all her members democrats or republicans, or interpret the constitution of the Union or of the States. Should it at any time attempt to legislate on these subjects, the people would regard their action with the same feeling they would the acts of Congress assuming to regulate the faith of the church. As to this point there can be no difference of opinion.

2. In the second place, it is equally plain that an unconstitutional law is void *ab initio*. It is no law. It is not obligatory on any person or upon any organization. If a man refuses to obey a law of Congress or of the States, which the courts pronounce unconstitutional, he is held harmless. His disobedience is justified. This is an important safeguard in church and state. As our constitution establishes certain fixed principles and rules, and limits the authority of all our courts, even the highest, any enactment or requisition inconsistent with its prescriptions, may be, and should be, disregarded. There is not a Presbytery in the land which would give heed to any Assembly which should forbid them to ordain a candidate unless he had passed through a full three-years course in some Theological Seminary. The constitution also prescribes the terms of Christian and ministerial communion, and these can only be altered by altering the constitution. This is the principle which is enunciated in our Book, when it says, that no constitutional or standing rule shall be considered binding, until it has been remitted to the Presbyteries and received their sanction. That is, the General Assembly cannot alter the constitution, or give binding force to anything inconsistent with it. This is perfectly consistent with the recognition of

the authority of the Assembly to "law down rules," within the limits of the constitution. The laws of Congress bind the people, if constitutional; so the acts of the Assembly are binding under the same conditions.

3. The third limitation is that imposed by the word of God. That anything contrary to the Scriptures can bind the conscience of any man, or be rightfully imposed upon him as a rule of faith or practice, no Protestant will for a moment admit. If all the ecclesiastical bodies in the world should pronounce that true, which God declares to be false; or that right, which He pronounces to be wrong, their declarations would not have the weight of a feather. No law of man can make that sin which is no sin, or that virtue which is not virtue. Should the Assembly decree that eating meat, drinking wine, using tobacco, or holding slaves, is sinful and a bar to Christian communion, if the word of God teaches the contrary, its decrees would bind his people no more than the decrees of Congress enjoining the worship of images or the adoration of the host. Here again, beyond question, we are on common ground.

Another great principle of our common Protestant Presbyterianism is the right of private judgment. It was said on the floor of the Assembly, in the warmth of debate, that the deliverances, acts, or injunctions, of that body, are to be assumed to be within the sphere of church-power, to be constitutional, and consistent with the word of God, and obeyed as such, until by competent authority the contrary is officially declared. This is the denial of the first principles of Christian liberty, whether civil or religious. Every man has not only the right to judge for himself on all these points, but is bound by his allegiance to God to claim and exercise it. The Bible teaches, and all Protestants believe, that the Spirit is promised and given as a teacher, not exclusively to the clergy but to all the people of God. Therefore, every Christian is bound to search the Scriptures, and to judge for himself whether the things decreed or commanded are consistent with that standard. Thus the early Christians acted when they refused to obey the constituted authorities of the Jewish church. Thus afterwards, although the Bible enjoined upon them to be obedient to the powers that be; yet, when the Roman magistrates re-

quired them to burn incense to idols, they resisted unto death. There had been no Reformation, had not God taught and enabled his people to assert this right of private judgment. Episcopacy would have been established in Scotland, and despotism in England, had not our Presbyterian and Puritan ancestors been men enough to claim and exercise the right to think for themselves, and to obey God rather than man. This right is recognized in the state. No man is bound to obey an unconstitutional law. If he errs in his judgment, and pronounces that to be unconstitutional, which is in fact legitimate, he must bear the penalty of disobedience. And so it is in the church. If an individual, or Presbytery, refuses to obey an injunction of the Assembly, from the conscientious conviction that it is contrary to the constitution or the word of God, he or it may be arraigned for disobedience, and condemned or justified according to the judgment of a competent court; for one Assembly is not bound by the decision of its predecessors; and may, therefore, justify disobedience to any of their injunctions, which it deems erroneous. On this right of private judgment we must all be agreed. Dr. Thomas and other leaders of the majority in the late Assembly repeatedly and expressly stated that former Assemblies had frequently made deliverances which they deemed to be contrary to the word of God. Of course they did not, and could not adopt them; nor could they require others to approve them, without demanding that men should approve what they believed God condemned. The deliverances of the Assembly, therefore, by common consent, bind the people and lower courts only when they are consistent with the constitution and the Scriptures, and of that consistency every man may and must judge, as he has to render an account to God.

Such, as we believe, are the principles in which nine-tenths of our ministers and members will concur. It follows from these principles that the General Assembly, unless expressly prohibited by the constitution, can exercise, when the emergency demands it, its power to correct abuses or evils, immediately in any part of the church. It has the right, on its responsibility to God, to refuse seats to delegates, or to dissolve any of the lower courts, if the safety or well being of the church

requires it. This follows from the scriptural principle of representation. Under the Old Testament, by the appointment of God, the elders of a tribe were the tribe; and the elders of the congregation were the congregation, and could act as such. Under the New Testament dispensation, the elders of the church, in council assembled, are the church. The elders of a particular church are that church, and the delegated elders of the whole church are the whole church, and are clothed with all church power, under the important limitations above specified.

In the second place, the right in question, and specially to exclude delegates, flows from the very nature of the Assembly as a court of Christ. It is a body of men duly appointed, consisting of those who recognize the Headship of Christ, the infallible authority of His word, and the Presbyterian system of doctrine and order. If any men present themselves as Commissioners, who openly and avowedly declare them no Christians, or no Presbyterians, it is plain that the Assembly should be bound to reject them. The avowal may be so explicit and public, made *viva voce* or over their written signatures, as to preclude the need of examination or proof. If any Presbytery should make an official declaration of Socinianism, and that declaration be signed by its Commissioners, published to the world, and circulated through the Assembly, we presume no one would deny that that body would be bound to say to those Commissioners, "you do not belong to the class of persons of whom, according to the Scriptures and the constitution of the church, this court is to be constituted." If there be any doubt as to the facts, those ought to be cleared up. But if the facts are beyond question, then the right and duty of the Assembly is immediate and imperative. It is said that it is contrary to natural justice that any man should be condemned unheard. But, in the first place, in the case supposed there is properly no condemnation, at least in the judicial sense of the term. The effect of the exclusion is not to depose, or even to suspend the parties from their office as ministers or elders, but simply, as it were, to arrest them and to remit them to the proper tribunal for trial. In the second place, a man cannot be said to be condemned without a hearing, who is condemned,

(or rather arrested), out of his own mouth, for his own declaration made *in præsenti.*

In the third place, this right is analogous to the right of expulsion. If a man should rise in the Assembly and blaspheme, he may immediately be expelled. There would be no need of a trial or an examination. And fourthly, this right of peremptory and immediate action is the right of self-preservation, which belongs to all bodies and associations. It is exercised by all legislative assemblies. Congress may rightfully exclude any avowed traitor from taking his seat in the council of the nation. Every judge has the right to protect the sanctuary of justice by immediately committing to prison any one who violates its dignity. General Sheridan, in the last battles before Richmond, deprived General Warren of his command on the field, and sent him to the rear. This was a tremendous punishment inflicted without a hearing. It may have been an act of cruelty or injustice, but the right thus to act cannot be questioned. General Washington did the same thing in the case of General Lee in the battle of Monmouth.

These remarks are all applicable to the case of dissolving a Presbytery. Should any such body make a declaration of Socinianism, or avow themselves to be infidels, the Assembly would not be bound to leave the people six months under the instruction and government of such open apostates. It would be its duty, in virtue of its charge of all the churches, immediately to dissolve the body, and deprive its members of all ecclesiastical power.

The views here expressed of the inherent power of our church courts, and especially of the General Assembly, were presented and defended at length in the pages of this *Review* for July, 1838, pp. 464—490. It was then shown: 1. That our church, from the first, adopted the standards of the Church of Scotland, both as to faith and form of government. 2. That in Scotland, so far from the Assembly being the creature of the Presbyteries and deriving its powers from them, it existed before the Presbyteries, and governed the church for years before any Presbytery was organized. It was the Assembly that formed first the Synods, and then the Presbyteries. 3. That the General Assembly in Scotland had from the begin-

ning acted as the governing body of the whole church, exercising, whenever it saw fit, original jurisdiction; acting directly on the Presbyteries, and individual ministers, citing, trying, condemning or acquitting them, as it deemed right; transferring pastors from one parish to another without the intervention of any of the lower courts; and, in short, exercising a general and immediate jurisdiction over the whole church. On this head we quoted from *Hill's Institutes*, the highest modern authority on the discipline and government of the Scottish Church, the following passage. After stating that the powers of the General Assembly are judicial, legislative, and executive, Dr. Hill says: "In the exercise of these powers, the General Assembly often issues peremptory mandates, summoning individuals and inferior courts to appear at its bar. It sends precise orders to particular judicatories, directing, assisting, or restraining them in the exercise of their functions, and its superintending, controlling authority, maintains soundness of doctrine, checks irregularity, and enforces general laws throughout all districts of the church." 4. That our *Confession of Faith* itself teaches, chap. xxxi. 2, that, "It belongeth to Synods and Councils, ministerially, to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of his church," &c. And that "the decrees and determinations of such councils, if consonant to the word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in his word." It is here taught not only what the power of church courts is, but also that it is from God, and not conferred by men. 5. Pages of that article of our *Review* are filled with citations from our records to show that the original Synod of Philadelphia, the United Synods of New York and Philadelphia, and the General Assembly, have uniformly acted as courts of original jurisdiction; acting immediately on individuals, sessions, and Presbyteries, and that the Assembly has ever assumed that it had the power to correct abuses, by the immediate exercise of its authority, when necessity required, in any part of the church. We cannot, therefore,

agree with those who denied the right of the General Assembly to exclude the Commissioners of the Presbytery of Louisville, or to dissolve the Presbytery itself. It is to be remembered, however, that the effect of dissolving a Presbytery, is not, as some of the speakers seemed to suppose, to suspend or to depose its members. It merely dissolves the bond which unites them as a church court. They might be attached to other Presbyteries, or disposed of as the Assembly saw fit.

We are aware that in answer to a protest of the New-school party, against the abrogation of the Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, the writers of that answer take different ground from that assumed above. They say: "1. The constitution of the Presbyterian Church, like that of our National Union, is a constitution of specific powers, granted by the Presbyteries, the fountains of power, to the Synods and General Assembly. 2. No powers not specifically granted can lawfully be inferred and assumed by the General Assembly, but only such as are indispensably necessary to carry into effect those specifically granted." On this it may be remarked: 1. That every one is aware that the Assembly is in the habit of appointing one or more persons to answer protests, who present their own particular views. It would be unfair to hold the Assembly responsible for the soundness of every argument which they may see fit to use. 2. The theory, the opposite to that assumed in this answer, was the basis of the whole action of the Assemblies of 1837 and 1838, and was constantly avowed in the debates. 3. Admitting that the Assembly of 1837 did commit itself to this false theory, that would have little weight against the uniform teaching and action of the Presbyterian Church, both in Scotland and in this country, in all periods of its history.

If it be acknowledged that the Assembly had the right to do what it did, the second question to be considered, is, was there any adequate ground for the exclusion of the Commissioners from the Louisville Presbytery, or for ordering the dissolution of every Presbytery who should admit any of the signers of the Declaration and Testimony. On this question every man has a right to his own opinion. For ourselves we think there was no adequate reason for such action. 1. Because the penalty

was unduly severe. It is among the heaviest within the power of the Assembly to inflict, and, therefore, should be reserved for extreme cases. 2. There was no important object to be gained. The church would not have been endangered in any of its important interests by the adoption of a milder course. 3. The Assembly itself virtually admitted that signing the Declaration and Testimony was not a sufficient reason for exclusion from our church courts. It allowed those who had signed it, and who openly avowed in the presence of the Assembly, their continued adhesion to it, to retain their seats to the end of the sessions. Yet it ordered that any Presbytery who should admit one of those signers, should be *ipso facto* dissolved for doing what the Assembly itself had done. 4. This action instead of tending to allay strife and division in the Border States, had a directly opposite tendency, and therefore was so earnestly deprecated by some of the wisest and best men of the church. 5. It places, or would place, if carried out, many ministers and churches in anomalous position, and put in jeopardy important interests. The dissolution of a Presbytery, as before remarked, does not suspend or depose its ministers, or separate them from the Presbyterian Church, or vacate their pulpits. Without further action it only throws all things into confusion.

These reasons however afford no justification of disobedience to the orders of the Assembly. A law is binding although severe or unwise. So the orders of the Assembly are binding, unless they transcend the sphere of church power, or are contrary to the constitution, or to the word of God.

As to the third question, which concerns the mode adopted to secure the ends aimed at, we believe, from all we can learn, there is little difference of opinion. The leaders of the majority themselves deprecated the action of Dr. McLean, which, for some reason they felt constrained to adopt. That a member should rise in his place, propose the exclusion of the members of a Presbytery, make a speech in favour of his motion, and then move the previous question, and thus prevent any other member from stating his objections to the motion, or his reasons for preferring a different course, was certainly a most extraordinary proceeding. And then the motion to refer the case of

the Presbytery of Louisville to a committee of the House, thus taking it out of the hands of the judicial committee, where it already was on the appeal of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, was irregular and unnecessary. It prevented the matter from coming up in the way which had been designed, and which would have secured a fair hearing of all parties, and a calm judicial decision.

In looking back over the proceedings of the Assembly, there is much for which the church should be thankful, and much which promises great good in the future.

In the first place, the Assembly recognized the right of protest and of free discussion, as belonging not only to its own members, but to all the members and ministers of the church. This was declared to be the birthright of Presbyterians. It was called a sacred right, with which the Assembly disclaimed all intention of interfering. The right of protest, as it has always been exercised, includes the right of dissenting from the deliverances and judgments of church courts, on the ground of their being unwise, unjust, unconstitutional, or unscriptural. It includes the right to make all proper efforts of proving the correctness of the grounds of objection, and to bring their brethren to agree with them.

Secondly: The Assembly recognized the principle that adhesion to its deliverances and judgment cannot be made a condition of Christian or ministerial communion. It would be a contradiction to allow of protest against a deliverance, and then demand approbation of it as a condition of membership in the church or ministry. Should the Assembly declare that the holding of slaves is not a sin, or a bar to Christian communion, and allow Dr. Thomas and others to protest against such declaration as unscriptural, could it then require him to approve and act upon it on pain of exclusion from the church? The judicial decisions of the Assembly are of course final, and must be submitted to, until the penalty be removed by a subsequent Assembly. Its orders and injunctions are to be respected in all cases, and obeyed, unless believed to be contrary to the constitution and the word of God. If an individual be arraigned for such disobedience, and the church courts, including the Assembly, censure him for the offence, he would have meekly to submit to

the infliction, (as the Quakers do for refusing to obey the military laws), or leave the church. It is plain that the Assembly recognized these principles when it adopted the papers proposed by Dr. Gurley and Dr. J. C. Lowrie. The former expressly recognized the right of those who are not able to subscribe to the testimonies of the Assembly of 1865, or to carry out its injunctions, to remain undisturbed in the church, provided they do not engage in movements defiant of the Assembly, and which lead to schism. The other paper does substantially the same thing. The Assembly has always acted on this principle in case of conscientious dissent from its testimonies, or failure to obey its injunctions. The abolitionists who openly repudiated the deliverance of the Assembly of 1845, and refused to act upon it in the exercise of discipline, were left to enjoy their constitutional liberty. That is, the Assembly avows its purpose of acting on the common sense principle adopted by every constitutional government. The state allows the people to think and say what they please about its laws, and to disobey them for conscience' sake, provided they do not disturb the public peace, and quietly submit to the penalty of disobedience, when judged to be without sufficient cause.

Thirdly: The doctrine taught by this Assembly respecting schism, is the scriptural doctrine on that subject, as it has ever been held in our church. Schism is separation from the church without adequate cause. It is a breach of Christian fellowship and subjection, enjoined by Christ on his people. This has ever been regarded as a great sin. No man is justifiable in thus breaking up the unity of the church, unless he is required to profess or to do something which the Bible condemns as false or wrong; or unless he is prohibited from professing or doing what the Bible commands. We, as Presbyterians, are required to profess and teach nothing but what is contained in our doctrinal standards, and we are required to do nothing but to conform to the form of government and discipline which we have voluntarily adopted. It would be a sad thing if the Union of the United States should be dissolved because Congress should enact an unjust tariff, or an unconstitutional bank-law, and it would be equally grievous if the church were to be rent asunder every time the General Assembly should, in the

judgment of a portion of its members, err in their testimony or injunctions.

Fourth: This Assembly teaches the scriptural doctrine concerning slavery. It distinctly asserts that slaveholding is not a sin or a bar to Christian communion. This it does in two ways: First, by declaring that the recent testimonies on this subject are not to be understood in any sense inconsistent with the former deliverances of the church. But, in 1845, the scriptural doctrine on this subject was not only distinctly stated, but elaborately sustained. The Assembly declares that it still adheres to that deliverance, and virtually reiterates it. Secondly, by saying that the errors intended to be denounced, the renunciation of which was insisted upon, were, 1. That slavery is a divine institution, "in the same category with marriage and civil government," (and therefore to be perpetuated and extended)—and, 2. That it is the mission of the church to conserve the institution. These declarations of the Assembly are contained in the paper offered by Dr. Krebs and in the Pastoral Letter.

Fifth: The Assembly takes scriptural and liberal ground on the subject of Christian union. It declares that it is desirous of retaining, or receiving into the church, all who sincerely adopt our standards of doctrine and government, who adhere to the testimony of the church, as just explained by the Assembly, and are willing to submit to its legitimate authority, that is, who are not schismatical in their spirit and measures. These principles are, in the paper presented by Dr. J. T. Smith, specially applied to the Southern churches. With regard to whom the Assembly says that it "greatly deplores the continued separation between ourselves and our Southern brethren, so long united in the bonds of Christian love and ecclesiastical fellowship; and expresses the earnest desire that the way may be soon opened for a reunion on the basis of our common standards, and on terms consistent with truth and righteousness."

In view of these declarations, it is the obvious duty of every minister and member of our church to labour to allay all further alienation and strife. We have here a platform, broad, scriptural, and just, on which the whole church, north, south, east, and west, may unite.

The two General Assemblies meeting at the same time in St. Louis, gave occasion to friendly intercourse between the two bodies. Messages of kind greeting were interchanged, and they united in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. All this met, and will meet, with general approbation, as tending to the promotion of Christian fellowship. Rev. Dr. Nelson appeared in our Assembly, and made a conciliatory and eloquent address. In his reply, Dr. Stanton, as Moderator, reciprocated the assurances of brotherly regard, and expressed himself as decidedly in favour of a closer union between the two bodies. He was understood to intimate that the principal causes of separation had been pro-slavery tendencies on the part of the Old-school, and laxness in matters of order on the part of the New-school. We are not sure that this was the meaning of the Moderator, although he was so understood by many of his hearers.

There cannot be a greater historical error, nor a more injurious imputation on the Old-school Church, than to insinuate that a zeal or tenderness about slavery was the motive which guided its action in 1837 and 1838. There is not a word about slavery in the Act and Testimony, nor in the proceedings of her convention, which sat in 1837 alongside of the Assembly; nor in any of the official documents on either side relating to the separation, nor in the debates which occupied the time of the House. To suppose that such men as Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, the early and faithful advocate of emancipation in Kentucky; the venerable Dr. Elliot of Pittsburgh; the late Dr. Green of Philadelphia, one of the authors of the testimony against slavery, adopted in 1818, and the whole Old-school body, especially the whole Synod of Pittsburgh, then regarded as the backbone of the church; to suppose, we say, that such men, while professing zeal for doctrine and order, were really influenced by a desire to protect slavery, is to suppose them to be hypocritical and dishonest—a set of false-pretenders. We have no idea that Dr. Stanton intended any such imputation, although his speech, unfortunately, is adapted to give some countenance to this slander, which has been frequently uttered by the more reckless among the enemies of our church. The avowed and real causes of separation were: 1. That while the Old-school insisted

on the cordial adoption of the system of doctrine taught in our standard, as the condition of ministerial communion; the New-school maintained that all that was required was the adoption of "the fundamental doctrines of religion." On this ground it was notorious that they freely received and ordained, as ministers, men who denied many of the distinctive principles of our system; that is, the principles which distinguish the doctrine of the Reformed Church from Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, and Arminianism. 2. The other cause of separation was, that the New-school received Congregational churches and ministers into organic union with our body; allowing men who had never adopted our standards, and who refused to adopt them, to sit in all our church courts and administer the discipline and government of the church. If these causes still exist, then the union of the two bodies would involve, on our part, an utter dereliction of principle. It would be a surrender at discretion. It would be an acknowledgment that we had been either false or misguided in all that was done, in effecting the deliverance of the church; or it would evince that we ourselves had apostatized from the faith of our fathers, and were willing to sacrifice our faith for unworthy ends. It would also be a grievous breach of trust, and would forfeit morally, if not legally, our title to the endowments of all our institutions. These endowments were given to a body holding the distinctive principles of the Old-school, and because it held them. In many cases, and those involving the largest benefactions, the money was given to the Old-school body as such, and is forfeited if it loses its distinctive character.

If the causes above specified have ceased to exist, then, there is no valid objection to the union of the two Assemblies. We believe, however, that they exist now in all their original force. The principle of lax interpretation of the Confession of Faith has of late years been all but officially avowed by the New-school. This was done in the *History of the Presbyterian Church*, recently set forth by their Publication Committee. The organ of their church in Philadelphia, says, if the union takes place, it must be on the principles of "*liberal* Presbyterianism." We know what liberal Christianity means, and it is not hard to understand what is meant by "liberal Presby-

terianism." It is no less notorious that the New-school has never taken official action against union with Congregationalists. There are Presbyteries in their connection with scarcely a single Presbyterian church within their limits. While, therefore, we believe that there are many sound Presbyterians in the New-school body, with whom we should rejoice to be united, we are persuaded that the great body, at least of the older members of our church, would regard an organic union of the two Assemblies as a great calamity, and as a great sin against our own principles. The principal danger on this subject arises from the fact that the separation between the Old and New-school occurred nearly thirty years ago; and consequently, a great part of our younger brethren are ignorant of its causes and necessity, and are, therefore, not prepared to estimate the gravity of the interests at stake.

This subject was brought before the Assembly in several overtures, which were referred to the appropriate committee, who reported the following resolutions, which were adopted:

Resolved, 1. This Assembly expresses its fraternal affection for the other branch of the Presbyterian Church, and its earnest desire for re-union at the earliest time consistent with agreement in doctrine, order, and polity, on the basis of a common standard and the prevalence of mutual confidence and love, which are so necessary to a happy union and to the permanent peace and prosperity of the united church.

Resolved, 2. That it be recommended to all churches and church courts, and to all ministers, ruling elders, and communicants, to cherish fraternal feelings, to cultivate Christian intercourse in the worship of God and in the promotion of the cause of Christ, and to avoid all needless controversies and contentions.

Resolved, 3. That a committee of nine (9) ministers and six (6) ruling elders be appointed, provided that a similar committee be appointed by the other Assembly now in session in this city, for the purpose of conferring in regard to the desirableness and practicability of re-union; and if, after conference and inquiry, such decision shall seem to be desirable and practicable, to suggest suitable measures for its accomplishment, and report to the next General Assembly.

The following committee was appointed by the Moderator:

Ministers.

J. M. Krebs, D. D., Synod of New York.
C. C. Beatty, D. D., Synod of Wheeling.
J. T. Backus, D. D., Synod of Albany.
P. D. Gurley, D. D., Synod of Baltimore.
J. G. Monfort, D. D., Synod of Cincinnati.
W. D. Howard, D. D., Synod of Pittsburgh.
W. E. Schenck, D. D., Synod of Philadelphia.
Villeroy D. Reed, D. D., Synod of New Jersey.
F. T. Brown, D. D., Synod of Chicago.

Elders.

James M. Ray, Synod of Northern Indiana.
Robert McKnight, Synod of Allegheny.
Sam'l Galloway, Synod of Ohio.
H. K. Clarke, Synod of Sandusky.
Geo. P. Strong, Synod of Missouri.
Prof. Ormond Beatty, Synod of Kentucky.

The Hymnal.

The committee to whom had been assigned the preparation of a new Hymn Book, notwithstanding the amount of adverse criticism they have encountered, succeeded in getting their work sanctioned, and authorized to be used in the churches. It has, however, been referred to an enlarged committee, to be modified and increased in size. While it is impossible, in matters of taste, to please everybody, we gather from what has been of late written on the subject, that there are certain points in which there is a general agreement: 1. We should have but one book,—the use of two or more is inconvenient, awkward, and expensive. 2. Whatever may be said on general principles, it is a historical fact, not to be ignored, that the Presbyterian Church, in Great Britain and America, is addicted to the worship of God in the use of the Psalms of the Old Testament. Their omission from a book designed for general use does violence to all our traditions and to the spirit of our church. There should be at least one metrical version of every Psalm. 3. It is to be remembered that singing in the sanctuary

is an act of worship. Didactic, exhortatory, or sentimental prayers are admitted to be offensive and unedifying. Hymns of like character are equally objectionable in public worship. 4. Hymns for children are as much out of place for a book designed for the sanctuary, as nursery prayers in a liturgy. 5. The mutilation or alteration of hymns should be avoided. The pastor can select the portions of a hymn he desires to be sung. It is commonly unnecessary thus to change an author's productions. Such changes are almost always for the worse; and often do violence to the cherished associations of the people, who are attached to the hymns in the form with which they are familiar. The thanks of the church are due to the committee for the labour, taste, and talent, exercised in the production of the new book. We hope they may be able so to modify it as to give general, if not universal, satisfaction.

SHORT NOTICES.

Presbyterian Historical Almanac and Annual Remembrancer of the Church, for 1865. By Joseph M. Wilson. Vol. VII. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, No. 111 South Tenth street. Pp. 406.

This work has an established reputation. It is a condensed record of matters of interest to the whole body of Presbyterians. It will be found of great practical value; a storehouse of information to ministers and people.

Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Fourth Series. Vol. VII. *Hengstenberg's Commentary on the Gospel of St. John.* Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke, 1865, pp. 541.

This Foreign Theological Library, of the Messrs. Clark, renders accessible to English readers almost all the important evangelical modern works of Germany. In this country the successive volumes can generally be procured of Messrs. Smith & English, of Philadelphia. This Commentary of Dr. Hengstenberg, on the Gospel of St. John, although probably not equal to some of his other works, is full of valuable information and fertile suggestions.

Commentary on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. By C. F. Keil, D.D., and F. Delitzsch, D.D., pp. 494.

This is another volume from the same press, and belonging to the same series. It is the production of two of the most eminent living scholars and divines of Germany. Although a complete work in itself, it forms part of a commentary on the Old Testament, which these distinguished men have in the course of preparation.

An Exposition of the First Epistle of John. By James Morgan, D.D. Belfast, Author of the "Scriptural Testimony to the Holy Spirit." Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1866, pp. 528.

Dr. Morgan has been for thirty-seven years pastor of one church in Belfast, Ireland. He tells us he has prepared this Exposition of the Epistle of John, the principal topic of which is "brotherly love," as a memorial of the peace and harmony which has so long prevailed among his people. The work consists of a course of lectures exegetical, doctrinal, and practical, on the whole epistle. It is distinguished by soundness, piety, and excellent judgment, and will doubtless prove acceptable and useful to a large class of readers.

Commentary on the Gospels of Luke and John. By Rev. Dr. Whedon, of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Carlton & Porter. Pp. 422.

It is a matter of gratulation that so many distinguished men, of all denominations, are turning their attention to the preparation of commentaries on the Holy Scriptures. This volume forms part of a work, now in progress, designed to embrace all the books of the New Testament, and ultimately those also of the Old Testament. It is written in a clear, terse, and forcible style. There is very little waste of words. The expositions are concise, to the point, and evangelical and edifying. It bids fair to be a very valuable work.

Prophecy viewed in respect to its Distinctive Nature, Special Function, and Proper Interpretation. By Patrick Fairbairn, D. D., Principal of the Free Church College, Glasgow; Author of "Typology of Scripture," "Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy." New York: Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry Street. 1866. Pp. 524.

Prophecy is now exposed to two principal perverting influences. The spirit of Rationalism strives to disprove or explain away its supernatural character, and Literalism to interpret it so as to favour the introduction of Judaism, both by weakening or destroying the argument from prophecy, in proof of the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, and by representing the future of Christ's kingdom as little more than the realization of the Jewish idea on that subject. The book of Dr. Fairbairn will be received with great interest. The importance and the difficulty of the subject, the high character of the author, and the special adaptation of his work to the state of the times, must secure for it a general and cordial welcome.

Giant Cities of Bashan; and Syria's Holy Places. By Rev. J. L. Porter, A. M., author of "Five Years in Damascus," &c. New York: T. Nelson & Sons, 137 Grand Street. 1866. Pp. 377.

Bashan, which fell to the portion of the half-tribe of Manasseh, has been less frequently explored than most other of the countries belonging to the ancient Jews. In many of its features, it is, perhaps, more remarkable than any of them. This book, not merely of travel, but of description and research, presents to the general reader a very instructive and important account of its characteristics and antiquities.

The Emphatic Diaglott: Containing the Original Text of the New Testament, with an interlineary word for word English Translation; a New Emphatic Version, based on the Interlineary Translation, &c. By Benjamin Wilson. New York: Fowler & Wells, 389 Broadway. 1865.

The title page of this book is too long and minute for transcription. The book evinces a good deal of labour, being fur-

nished with various readings, references to parallel passages, and occasional critical or illustrative remarks. We cannot see the advantage of the interlinear translation, unless it be to give the English reader some idea of the Greek idiom. As a help to the student of Greek it can be of little importance. Every attempt, however, to induce people to study the Scriptures, especially in the form in which they came from the sacred writers, is to be regarded as a good work.

Life of Emanuel Swedenborg; together with a brief Synopsis of his Writings, both Philosophical and Theological. By William White. With an Introduction by B. F. Barrett. First American Edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. Pp. 270.

Swedenborg has been called by his friends, "the most unknown," and "the best abused man in the world." If thus unknown, it must be because he is incomprehensible, for more lives and memoirs of the man, and expositions of his doctrine, have been published within the last five and twenty, or thirty years, than have been devoted to any other celebrity. This small, well-printed, and compact volume, may assist the public in gaining some knowledge of a very remarkable man, and of a system of doctrine which still evinces great vitality.

The Living Forces of the Universe. The Temple and the Worshippers. Know and Govern Thyself. By George W. Thompson. Philadelphia: Howard Challen. 1866. Pp. 358.

"Well knowing," says the author, "the tendency to degradation in vulgar, rude, animalistic, and human imaginates, and in a language which corresponds with and embodies them, and conscious of the necessities of pure ideas and of the proper dignity and exaltation which should accompany them, the latter have been adopted, and rather than lower these to the standard of a life which need all elements of purification and elevation, a Glossary of a few words not current among general readers, is added, with the hope that the work will be more widely useful and acceptable."

With all the help of the Glossary, we have to confess that we soon became lost in a fog of misty verbiage, to which even "vulgar, rude, animalistic, and human imaginates," if we could understand precisely what they are, might be preferable. By no effort of "intusception," or "discriminate injection of self into the object of cognition," could we comprehend the work, and we have therefore been obliged to abandon it as thoroughly "objectio-facient, *i. e.*, set over in independent or quasi independent entity."

It is the first duty of a writer on philosophical subjects to study clearness and simplicity in his language, and never to coin

a new word, when an old one will serve his purpose. The author by disregarding this obvious rule, has exposed himself not merely to misapprehension, but to ridicule, and to more perhaps than is deserved; for the evident seriousness and earnestness with which he writes, and the vigour and freshness of his conceptions, are worthy of a better style. Should the proposed continuation of the work have but the common merit of being intelligible, we will then be able to discuss its claims to be considered as a new philosophy with a new method, and whether its tendency will be for good or evil.

Life of Benjamin Silliman, M. D., LL.D., late Professor of Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Geology, in Yale College, chiefly from his Manuscript Reminiscences, Diaries, and Correspondence. By George P. Fisher, Professor in Yale College. In two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1866.

Professor Silliman was beyond all question one of the high men of his age and country. Few of his American contemporaries were so widely and favourably known, not only in the scientific world, but wherever elegant letters, brilliant oratory, with manhood, Christian excellence, graceful manners, social amenity, the dignity, courtesy, and courage of the true gentleman, united in rarest symmetry, are appreciated. His majestic form and radiant countenance not only made him, to the eye of the stranger, *facile princeps* in almost any group of men, however eminent, but they rendered his very presence a power and inspiration in all circles and assemblies, private and public, collegiate, scientific, social, and Christian. He was not, indeed, remarkable for original discovery, or for logical method. But his brilliant rhetoric, his intellectual quickness, activity, and perseverance; his enterprise and tact, his unfailing benevolence and suavity, enabled him to surpass all others in introducing modern science to the country, and exalting it in public estimation. Rarely has science, in any of its branches, enjoyed the advantage of such successful experiments, rich illustration, and fascinating eloquence. To have established the *Journal of Science*, and edited it with success until it was passed over to the able editorship of his son and son-in-law, under which it continues to flourish in the forty-eighth year of its existence, is an achievement possible only to an extraordinary man.

Professor Silliman, owing to the associations of birth, nurture, marriage, foreign travel, scientific and professional eminence, high position in Yale College, and as the organ of communication between scientific men and the public, through the pages of his journal, along with the personal qualities before mentioned, added to an extraordinary love and facility for letter-

writing, and the full continuance of his intellectual powers to the day of his death, at the age of eighty-five, had a prodigious extent and variety of significant correspondence on great subjects with great men, including many of the most illustrious of the present century in both hemispheres. He was withal wont to make and keep memoranda of all important events. Of these materials the two copious volumes before us are chiefly made up. They have been selected and put together with great good judgment and taste, by Prof. Fisher, whose comments and suggestions are exceedingly just and apposite. Altogether, few biographies have so much to charm and instruct, or are so thoroughly readable and permanently valuable. It would be easy to fill up an article with tempting extracts. We must, however, restrict ourselves to a few, and first of those which reflect his religious principles and Christian feelings.

Verging towards four-score years, he thus writes to a sceptical friend:

"*My Dear* ——: I cannot desert my Saviour—Him who spoke as never man spake, while he knew what was in man; who has paid my debt while I was bankrupt; and who sustained in my stead the penalties of a violated law. I cannot desert him, and repose my confidence in the visions of so-called mediums." Vol. ii. p. 254.

On retiring from the active labours of his professorship, at the ripe age of seventy-five years, he thus uttered his feelings:

"For myself, in the evening of my life, may I be every day ready to die, trusting in thy mercy through the Redeemer of men, and if power and opportunity to be useful are still continued to me, may I have a disposition as well as ability, to honour Thee and to benefit my fellow-men. For my salvation I depend entirely upon the Redeemer. In the sight of God I have no merits of my own, and feel deeply that, if I am saved, it will be of grace and not of works. I have none to offer that are worthy of Thine acceptance." Vol. ii. p. 235.

Writing to Dr. John Griscom, in 1851, he says: "There is no safety in any reliance except our Saviour. As we go on in life, he becomes more and more precious to us. He has paid our debt, and sustained the penalty of the law for us, and salvation through Him is a gift as free as it is all-sufficient and indispensable." P. 11.

Such delightful Christian outbreathings might be quoted almost indefinitely. But we hasten to quote from a generous and appreciative estimate of Professor Silliman by Professor Joseph Henry, (one of a vast number of celebrated men whose writings or sayings appear in these volumes,) a passage which

will explain to our readers some of the difficulties, and some of the defects of periodical journals, in a way which none can appreciate but those who conduct them.

"In reply to some remarks on an article of less scientific merit than the general standard of the journal, Professor Silliman once said to me, 'Could you see what I reject, and the amount of correspondence which such rejection involves, you would not be surprised that I occasionally suffer an article to appear not strictly in accordance with my own views. I try, however, to express disagreeable truths in language as little offensive as possible; to encourage beginners, and to elicit observations of natural phenomena, even from those who make no pretensions to science.'" P. 333.

We are glad of the opportunity to put in permanent record on our pages a deserved tribute to one whose early death alone prevented his attaining both a living and posthumous celebrity second to none of our great scientists—as also to his son, who so worthily bears his name, as the honoured head of the Institution which his father adorned. Professor Silliman made the following notes of what he styles a "Brief Residence at Princeton." Vol. i. pp. 109-10.

"At this celebrated seat of learning, an eminent gentleman, Dr. John Maclean, resided, as professor of chemistry, &c. I early attained an introduction to him by correspondence, and he favoured me with a list of books for the promotion of my studies. Among these were Chaptal's, Lavoisier's and Fourcroy's Chemistry, Scheele's Essays, Bergman's Works, Kirwan's Mineralogy, &c. I also passed a few days with Dr. Maclean in my different transits to and from Philadelphia, and obtained from him a general insight into my future occupation; inspected his library and apparatus, and obtained his advice regarding many things. Dr. Maclean was a man of brilliant mind, with all the acumen of his native Scotland; and a sprinkling of wit gave variety to his conversation. I regard him as my earliest master of chemistry, and Princeton as my first starting point in that pursuit; although I had not an opportunity to attend any lectures there. Mrs. Maclean was a lovely woman, and made my visits at the house very pleasant to me. She was a sister of Commodore Bainbridge, afterwards signalized by the capture of the British frigate *Java*, in the war of 1812–15. Mrs. Maclean gave me an introduction to the family of Commodore Bainbridge, in Philadelphia, in which I was an occasional visitor. Dr. Maclean, the President of Princeton College, at this time and for some years

past, is the worthy son of Professor Maclean, and does honour to his father and the institution over which he ably presides."

History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By John Anthony Froude, M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. V., VI. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1866.

We have noticed with high appreciation the previous volumes of this great work as they have successively appeared. We know of no author who sheds so much light on English history, civil and ecclesiastical, as connected with the Protestant Reformation. The author's religious sympathies are not very certainly indicated. He is no Papist. How far he goes with evangelical Protestanism, in his personal convictions, sometimes appears questionable. But whatever they may be, they do not often swerve his mind from its severely impartial and judicial attitude. He brings much to light that was before unknown concerning this great historical era. He presents it in a clear, chaste, and graphic style. He strings together the sober facts of history in a narrative so vivid, and with descriptions so picturesque, as to enchain the reader with all the charms of a novel. His account of the trial, sentence, recantation, and death of Cranmer affords a fine specimen of all this. We cannot forbear noticing the admirable appearance, including the typography of the Riverside press, in which Scribner presents this and so many of his publications.

A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with Special Reference to Ministers and Students. By John Peter Lange, D. D., in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated from the German, and edited with additions original and selected, by Philip Schaff, D. D., in connection with American Divines of various Evangelical Denominations. Vol. II., of the New Testament, containing the Gospel according to Mark, and the Gospel according to Luke. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

The great work of which the second volume is here presented to the public was described at length in an extended article in this journal in connection with the publication of the first volume.* To this we must refer our readers for a competent analysis of its contents and character. Its high value for the purposes indicated in the title-page is undeniable. The large sale of the first volume shows the high appreciation of it by our American divines and scholars. The few blemishes of German origin found in it, do not compare with its great and peerless excellence. These will be largely guarded against by the American editors and translators. It is no slight pledge of

*See *Princeton Review*, Oct. 1864, Art. IV.

this, that Dr. Shedd has superintended the translation and revision of Mark's Gospel, while Drs. Schaff and Starbuck have had the revision of that by Luke, which is the work of a very sound Dutch divine and scholar, Dr. Oosterzee, of Utrecht.

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, Part II., from Samuel to the Captivity. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D. D., Dean of Westminster. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. [*Published by arrangement with the author.*]

In this large and solid volume the publisher treats us to another specimen of the luxurious Riverside typography. The learning, raciness, vigour and clearness which characterize all of Dean Stanley's productions are conspicuous in this. The work is profoundly instructive and entertaining to all lovers of sacred history, and students of the Old Testament. We detect occasional outcroppings of the author's Broad-church latitudinarian proclivities. The work, however, is not mainly doctrinal, and its doctrinal deflections do not destroy its value as history, or interest as a narrative.

Library of Old English Divines, under the editorial supervision of William G. T. Shedd, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions, by Robert South, D. D., Prebendary of Westminster, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In Five Volumes. Volume I. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. 1866. W. W. Smith, agent in Princeton.

We wish all success to this great undertaking of these enterprising publishers. The old English divines, such as Leighton, Hooker, Barrow, Bunyan, Charnock, Jeremy Taylor, Cudworth, and many others the like, whose works it is designed to give to the public in this series, would add much to the resources, to the wealth of didactic, esthetic, devotional and homiletical matter in our theological and ministerial libraries. They would aid greatly to enrich not only the minds of clergymen, but of thinking and cultivated men generally. The editorial supervision of Dr. Shedd is a pledge that the selection will be judiciously made.

The sermons of South, with which the series is here introduced to us, do not need to be critically characterized by us. The robustness, originality, and clearness of his thought, uttered in a style of extraordinary density, force, and vivacity, have made him a classic among preachers, whose sermons it must be ever profitable for young ministers to study. In saying this, we intend not to be sponsors for his doctrines or his spirit. In the former he was sometimes lax or erratic. In the latter, his bitterness was often too caustic to consist with Chris-

tian charity. But this aside, his sermons still remain among the first models of pulpit eloquence, of flashing wit, and contain the very marrow and pith of thought. We trust that the response of the public to the beginning of this great series, in the beautiful type of the Riverside press, will encourage the publishers to continue and complete it.

The Shadow of Christianity in the Genesis of the Christian State. A Treatise for the Times. By the Author of "Apocatastasis." New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. W. W. Smith, agent in Princeton.

A noble topic is here treated by some one who has evidently thought much upon it, and who betrays no little capacity and preparation for his task. The book abounds with many original and just observations in reference to the church, state, sociology, and political economy. It also abounds in extreme and one-sided views. His idea of the proper materials and organization of the church and the state cannot be realized before the millennium. Even then, the author's definition of the church as "a self-organizing, self-legislating, self-governing, free DEMOCRACY," will be out of place.

Remarks on Dr. Bushnell's "Vicarious Sacrifice." By Rev. W. W. Andrews. Hartford: Press of Case, Lockwood & Co. 1866.

This considerable pamphlet is prefaced with the following *imprimatur:*

"The following paper, prepared for the Hartford Fourth Association, and read before it, is now published at its request, and according to the unanimous desire of a large number of other clergymen who were present at its meeting.

C. E. STOWE, *Moderator.*"

The paper in question is able and clear. It shows a large knowledge of scripture and church theology. It thoroughly repudiates Dr. Bushnell's theories, and exposes their fallacy. But we have thought it worth while to produce the endorsement given to the disquisition, because it so explicitly asserts certain views of the atonement, which it has been so much a fashion in parts of New England to stigmatize as absurd and obsolete. He says that Christ "by dying in the common nature of man, and as bearing the guilt of all men's sins, made a true atonement." P. 63. "Then was justice satisfied, because the righteous sentence had been executed upon the offending race in its sinless Head." P. 54. Speaking of the faith of those who believe the Trinity and Incarnation, he says, "there have been diversities of opinion as to the explanation of the fact, but none as to the fact itself, that forgiveness comes to man *in virtue of*

Christ's dying under a penal curse for sin." Much more of similar import might be quoted. He also argues that δικαιόω means "to declare just in a forensic sense, *to absolve judicially.*" Pp. 60–1. Again:

"The orthodox doctrine of the Trinity makes subordination with equality to be found amongst the Persons of the Godhead, who exist from eternity as the Father, absolute and underived; as the Son, the eternally begotten of the Father; and as the Spirit, eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. There is no inferiority in these Divine relationships." P. 41.

These orthodox views are mixed with and warped by the realistic theory of the unity of our race, according to which Christ became consubstantial with it, so that his acts are their acts, and his redemption universal. This, however, does not affect the orthodoxy of the view presented as to the *nature* of the atonement.

Records from the Life of S. V. S. Wilder. Published by the American Tract Society. W. W. Smith, agent in Princeton.

This is a record of the life and deeds of one of the most eminent of our American Christian merchants. He resided many years in Paris, in the prosecution of his business, omitting no opportunity to spread evangelical religion in that metropolis, and elsewhere in France. He became opulent in early life. He consecrated his talents and resources to his Divine Master, whom he served efficiently in every sphere of life. He was for a long period President of the American Tract Society, which now publishes this memoir in honour of his memory. This whole biography shows him to have been an uncommon man. It is excellent reading for young men. They who can read it without catching some high inspirations toward all that is good and Christian and man-worthy, must be either above further improvement or below it.

The Women of Methodism: Its three Foundresses, Susanna West, the Countess of Huntingdon, and Barbara Beck, with Sketches of their Female Associates and Successors in the Early History of the Denomination. By Abel Stevens, LL.D. A Centenary Offering to the Women of American Methodism, from the American Methodist Ladies' Centenary Association. New York: Carlton & Porter, 1866.

The fitness and interest of such a work, well executed, at the present time, are obvious, and Dr. Stevens has in various productions proved himself an adept in Methodist biography and historiography. He is quite faithful in noting the thorough Calvinism of the Countess of Huntingdon. But he classes her and her circle with Methodists, on account of their association with Whitefield. There is perhaps some ground for this, although the term Methodist, in this country, now imports not

only an adherent of Methodistic polity, but of Arminianism in doctrine. But this application of the term is overdone when those Presbyterians and Congregationalists in this country, who favoured Whitefield, are styled Methodists. Our attention was recently called to the fact that, in a late History of Methodism, (we believe by Dr. Stevens), Princeton College was said to have been founded by the Methodists! The only ground for such a statement is the mere fact that its founders belonged to that class of Presbyterian ministers who countenanced Whitefield's preaching.

The Young Lady of Pleasure.
Green Pastures for Christ's Little Ones.
Basil on Honesty and Industry.
Bertha Allston, or the Good Step-Mother.

These excellent books for children and youth, are published by the American Tract Society, New York, and for sale by Mr. Wm. W. Smith, Agent, Princeton.

In Trust; or Dr. Bertrand's Household. By Amanda M. Douglass. Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1866.

Natural History. A Manual of Zoölogy, for Schools, Colleges, and the General Reader. By Sanborn Tenney, A. M., author of Geology, etc., Professor of Natural History in Vassar College. Illustrated with over Five Hundred Engravings. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1866.

So far as our knowledge goes of the existing books on this subject, that before us supplies a desideratum. We know of nothing so conveniently adapted, and withal so attractive, for those seeking elementary knowledge of Zoölogy.

Temperance Recollections. Labours, Defeats, Triumphs. An Autobiography. By John Marsh, D. D., Secretary of the First Three National Temperance Conventions, and thirty years Corresponding Secretary and Editor of the *American Temperance Union.* New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1866.

The friends of temperance will thank the venerable author for this contribution to the history of the great Reformation wrought on this subject within the last forty years. No other man could have written this book. Though nearly an octogenarian, he still holds the pen of a ready and vivacious writer. His eye is not dimmed, nor his natural force abated. Every important measure, and every important person connected with the progress of this cause, are here brought to view. We do not, of course, coincide with all the exegetical or ethical opinions of the veteran author in regard to all drinks capable of producing inebriation. This, however, does not hinder our high appreciation of his volume, as an interesting and valuable contribution to one of the most blessed reformations of modern times.

Monumenta Sacra Inedita. Nova Collectio. Volumen Quintum. Epistolæ Pauli et Catholicæ fere integræ ex libro Porphyrii Episcopi palimpsesto sæculi octavi vel noni, nuper ex oriente aleato, rara textus antiquitate insigni, eruit atque edidit A. F. C. Tischendorf. 1865. 4to. Pp. xxiii and 364.

In 1862 Tischendorf went to St. Petersburgh, to deliver up to the custody of the Czar, the famous Sinaitic Codex, which he had discovered and published. While there, he formed the acquaintance of Archimandrite (now Bishop) Porphyry Uspenski, and was shown the Greek manuscripts gathered by him in his journeys to the East. Among these there was one which he saw at the first glance to be a palimpsest, and which Porphyry had also recognized as such, but without knowing what it contained, or suspecting that it possessed any other than a palæographical value. Tischendorf's practised eye discerned enough in a brief examination to satisfy him that an uncial manuscript of the New Testament, in whole or in part, lay hid beneath the more modern writing. A few days after he was allowed to have it in his own rooms and apply chemicals to a couple of pages, with the view of restoring the faded letters. This was so successfully done, that Porphyry exclaimed in rapture, "See Lazarus risen from the tomb!" The result was an agreement that Tischendorf should take the precious treasure to Leipsic for a year, that he might master its contents. He found the task more difficult than he imagined, and more time was consumed upon it than he at first thought would be required. He succeeded, however, in reading the whole of it, with very trifling exceptions, in the course of eighteen months.

The manuscript consists of 325 small octavo pages. The more recent writing in literæ minusculæ is an elegant copy of the work of Euthalius, deacon of Alexandria, on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul, first published by Zaccagni in 1698, together with the complete text of these books. The excellence of the latter leads to the conclusion that it too was drawn from the work of Euthalius, and extracts from it will be printed in the next volume of the *Monumenta*. The date, as gathered from a subscription at the close, is A. D. 1301.

It is a fortunate circumstance that in putting old manuscripts to a new use the original form was retained; even the length of the lines and the number of them on a page being conformed to those which had been erased. Consequently none of the old text is cut away; only the notes on the upper margin indicating the feast-days have suffered occasionally. By a careful examination of the original numbering of the sheets, Tischendorf succeeded in restoring them to their primitive order. It appears that the old uncial manuscript contained, 1. The Acts of the

Apostles; 2. The Catholic Epistles; 3. The Epistles of Paul; 4. The Martyrdom of Peter and Paul; and finally the Apocalypse. Three leaves of the first sheet are missing, so that the extant text begins with Acts ii. 9; the last fifteen verses of the book of Revelation are also wanting. Three leaves are also missing in the catholic epistles, and nine in the epistles of Paul. All that remains is legible, with the exception of a very few verses and occasional words and letters. The inscriptions and subscriptions to the Epistles not being written with ink but with some other material, which the chemicals failed to restore, have been but partially recovered. From the character of the writing, the peculiarities of the orthography, the punctuation, abbreviations, and the use of accents and breathings, Tischendorf assigns it to the eighth or ninth century. And the correspondence of the text in general with the oldest and best authorities leads him to assign to it a very high value. It adds to its interest and worth, that uncial manuscripts of the book of Revelation are comparatively rare.

This volume contains a reprint in the uncial character of the Catholic Epistles and the Epistles of Paul, one page of *fac simile* being added at the end. The Acts of the Apostles and the Revelation are reserved for another volume.

ERRATA.

Page 487, line 17, *for* them *read* themselves.
19, *for* should *read* would.

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1866.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Eloquence a Virtue; or, Outlines of a Systematic Rhetoric.* Translated from the German of Dr. FRANCIS THEREMIN, by WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD. With an Introductory Essay.

Demosthenes und Massillon, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Beredsamkeit. Von Dr. FRANZ THEREMIN. Berlin, 1845.

Elements of the Art of Rhetoric. Adapted for use in Colleges and Academies, and for Private Study. By HENRY N. DAY.

THE design in placing the titles of these books at the head of our article is not to prepare the way for an elaborate critique of the volumes which bear them, but rather to call attention to them as containing in substance, and that in its best expression, what of value has been said in systematic form on the general subject of which they treat. They are plain books, and easily accessible, and we therefore cheerfully leave the vindication of this our statement regarding them, the thorough testing of which we bespeak, to a careful examination of the works themselves, by those interested in the increase and elevation of the oratorical power of the pulpit; merely premising that "Demosthenes und Massillon" is the presentation of the abstract principles of "Eloquence a Virtue" in concrete shape, or as

embodied in the orations of Demosthenes and the sermons of Massillon. We believe these volumes contain the great principles of rhetoric with which the clergy must be familiar in order best to fulfil their mission in reaching, winning, and saving men.

Passing on, and attempting to answer the question, What is the character of the preaching demanded by the times in which we live? the preliminary inquiry evidently is, What are the characteristics of the times? What special influences are at work in the world? What peculiarities mark this age? Clearly everything depends upon the answer to this. In the grand problem—How is the gospel to be brought home to men? we are to look upon "*the times*," as constituting the one variable quantity. *Man* remains essentially the same—spiritual, immortal, yet sinning, and perishing in his rebellion against God. The *gospel* remains essentially the same—the Son of God incarnate, obeying, suffering, dying as the sinner's substitute—freely offered of God to man's faith as the way of salvation. The *times*, with their influences and circumstances, change daily in slighter degree, and in the course of generations often, if not ordinarily, change essentially. While, therefore, acknowledging the sole efficiency of the Holy Spirit, it must yet be admitted, as in accordance with the Divine method, that a message to men, to be heard and heeded of men, must recognize their altered circumstances. What, then, are some of the characteristics of the present time?

A glance, even the most superficial, cannot fail to fix upon *the extraordinary activity of what may be called the scientific spirit*, as a marked feature of this age with its civilization. The work began more than a century ago, with the realm of physical nature. During all this period until the present day, the process of correcting and defining the ideas of men touching the outer world has gone on with accelerated speed, until, out of the once chaotic mass of fact and truth, order and system have everywhere been evoked, and the domain of science has been extended to the whole sphere of terrestrial existence, and to the material aspects of the starry heavens. From the ice rivers of Greenland to the fiery mountains of the Antarctic Continent—from the grain of sand at one's feet to the nebulæ

in the outer-deeps of space—from the fuchsia which blooms in the green-house of to-day to the tree ferns of the geologic periods of a thousand ages gone, Science has pushed her investigations, everywhere recording, arranging, classifying, systematizing, until, to the thinking, intelligent man, the world of nature is now a different world from what it was to the man of like mind of a century ago—different in its rocks and plants, in its clouds and lightnings, and tempests and rainbows—different, in short, in everything, from the mystic dance of the atoms to the sublimer dance of the stars. Nor has this scientific spirit of the age confined itself exclusively to the physical world; it has overleaped all such bounds, and pushed its inquiries into the regions bordering upon this, in which work the forces which have to do with the increase of wealth and the progress of nations, and on into the province of the more subtile spiritual forces which appear in the human soul and in human history, until, in the works of its masters, political economy has almost taken place among the exact sciences; until, in the hands of such men as Hamilton, and McCosh, the graver questions of metaphysics and logic, even where not answered, have become as clearly defined in statement as problems in geometry; and until, in the hands of those whose coming we wait, a philosophy of history will no longer be among the impossibilities. As this work of the century in its more palpable forms approached completion, the same processes began to be applied to literature and art. Criticism began striving to take on the scientific form. Men were no longer satisfied with a few empirical rules, reverenced and applied simply because an Aristotle or a Blair, some giant or some pigmy, had pronounced them truth. The power which had accomplished so much in behalf of order in other departments, led men, in its workings in this sphere, to conclude, by an iron logic, that every art must have its basis of principles, which may, at least in measure, be ascertained and scientifically arranged, and by which one can judge correctly of its products. As a result, we have had a new class of writings, which the seventeenth century, or even the eighteenth, could not have produced; comprising, in the field of general literature, the works of such men as Gœthe and Schiller, Hazlitt

and Coleridge, and the whole line of modern British essayists, and, in the field of special art, such elaborate criticisms as that of Dr. Hermann Ulrici on the plays of Shakespeare, and the "Modern Painters," and kindred works of John Ruskin.

To the man of intelligence and thought, the world of art is not the same as it was to one of like power of a century ago. Not that great art is at all different now from what it was then; not that we can teach a man now by rule to write a great poem, or paint a great picture, or improvise a sublime song, or extemporize a masterly oration, any more than we can teach a lark to flap its wings by instruction out of Whewell, or a nightingale to sing according to the musical grammar of Calcott; not, above everything else, that any other than God can make the great artist, and not that any other than a great artist can produce a grand poem, or painting, or song, or oration; but that, given the great artist, made of God, and clothed of him with his mission, we have all this knowledge to aid him in his work, and, given the man of common sense and culture with the discerning eye, he has all this knowledge at his command to enable him to study, and understand, and give intelligent judgment concerning the artist's great productions. The two men, of the past and of the present, brought side by side, look upon essentially the same thing, but he of the present with different and vastly clearer vision. This restless scientific activity thus reaches and employs itself in every department of thought. The educated, thinking men in every community are under its dominant influence, and though not with the masses the chief moulding force, it yet exerts more or less power of restraint and control far down among them. There is, consequently, everywhere a demand, within certain limits, for the philosophic and the artistic in the method and form of whatever aspires to be considered a literary production before it can gain the attention of men.

As a second feature of the times, one cannot but note *the rage for novelty* which so possesses the masses. As a fact, the world, in so far as our knowledge of its occurrences is concerned, is another world from what it was a century since. Then the news came from a region comparatively narrow, travelling at the slow pace of the stage-coach, the mounted

post, or the sailing vessel, and was narrowly diffused by a few weekly journals. It furnished but little of the novel to excite men. The progress of science and art has latterly brought the world in its vast regions into intimate communion and union of parts. With steam and electricity at his service, the professional man, the merchant or the mechanic, has for years been able to read in his daily paper, before breakfast, of the chief events of the past night over a region inhabited by fifty millions of people, while the recent successful completion of the Atlantic Telegraph now brings within the range of this, his morning glance, every startling event of the last evening occurring in christendom. Circumstances seem thus providentially arranged, if not to develop, at least to meet, the craving for the new and exciting. But however developed, the fact of such a tendency is beyond dispute. It is very marked in the reading of the masses of the present day. This may well be styled *the era of novels*, and of base and worthless novels at that. Solid literature does not furnish enough of excitement. All through the range of reading, in papers, magazines, and books, to meet the demands of multitudinous readers, we have the descending scale all the way to the bottom, from the weekly sheet of sensation tales, which, after its brazen manner, insists on pressing its way up into good society, to the despicable page which knows its friends too well to think of any such aim; from the pretentious magazine, which, while seeking to exalt itself to the chief literary seat, scarcely dares to tell the truth lest it should not be new, to the yellow-covered pamphlet, which is so irredeemably base as never to attempt anything better than a bald lie; from the portly volume which aspires to a place in the church library, to the unbound, ten cent sheet, which never comes to the light of day, and upon which the eyes of the man of virtue never fall. Public lectures and amusements have moved in the same direction, until in their downward reach there is scarcely anything, however offensive to sound sense, cultivated taste, correct morals, and right religious feeling, that fails to find a place to exhibit itself and an audience to witness the exhibition, provided only that it be novel. Nor has this tendency left the *religion* of the day untouched and uninfluenced. No thinking man has failed

to mark its presence in the work of the Sabbath-school; in changing the character of the instruction, until we hear too little of the solid portions of the Scripture, while pointless stories are often substituted for God's truth; in transforming the addresses, until, in some regions, one who is not equal to Gough as a mimic, to Blondin as a rope-walker, and to Punch as a punster, is hardly thought to be fitted to speak to an audience of children; in metamorphosing the library, until in many cases there is little left to be read but vapid, so-called religious novels, which, in spite of all their pretensions and of all the puffing of the religious press, are, in fact, in their own essential nature, at war with common sense, morality, and religion, and, in their necessary influence, irretrievably, we had almost said, infinitely bad. The same spirit has not hesitated to invade and desecrate even the pulpit with its unseemly ways. Tradition tells us that, at a certain stage in their progress, Dr. Archibald Alexander used to address his classes in Princeton Theological Seminary on the subject of popularity as preachers, somewhat on this wise: "Young gentlemen, you can be popular as preachers. It's the easiest thing in the world. It does not require any genius, or common sense, or study, or culture. Secure access to the columns of the newspaper and advertise, that on Sunday, at the usual hours of service, you will preach standing on your head, and your house will be crowded. It's easy to be popular in that way, if you want to be." In our day we could bring, from the Saturday dailies of many a city, advertisements, in which clergymen propose, in all soberness, to perform, for the public entertainment, feats quite as absurd as that suggested by the great educator of ministers. It would need no prophet to predict the results of all this, even were they yet in the far future; and, since they are here in the present, it takes no seer to discern what they are. This is not the place to demonstrate what must be the logical result of reading novels only, and only poor ones at that. The man who thinks and reasons for himself knows what it must be. We are coming, in fact, upon a public with one of its great elements having no mental muscle with which to lay hold of truth, caring nothing for our standard English literature, taking no interest in theology or the truth of God, and going

to church, if at all, to be entertained rather than instructed. We are training up a generation by the reading of books filled with pretended facts which are yet contrary to the nature of things, of men, and of God, with a morality not of God, a religion not of Christ, and a spirit infused of Mammon and Fashion, rather than of the Holy Ghost; and, in so training them, we are destroying all taste for that which is true and Christ-like, and almost barring the possibility of their becoming the powerful thinkers, and the earnest practical workers which the exigencies of the church demand for its mission. The day may not have come yet when the people of God are ready to enter their solemn protest, and to sweep all such trash out of church, Sabbath-school, and family, but it must come sooner or later, for God's government is so ordered that it never suffers a foolish, a base, or an evil thing to perpetuate its existence in his church for ever. But however that may be, there is no disputing the *fact* of this morbid tendency to novelty, and that is all that need be contended for, now and here. It manifests itself everywhere, reaching to some extent all classes. The cultivated and refined are not wholly free from it; with the masses it is the moulding, ruling tendency. We are almost repeating the character of the old Greek nation, in its decline, in the time of Paul, with whom the one question was—"What is there new?" It need hardly be said that, in consequence of this, the demand for the novel, the unusual, the startling, is brought to bear upon everything which aspires to the dignity of literature, and almost made a condition of gaining access to men.

A third feature of the age, and the last we shall enumerate, is *the prevalence of the utilitarian spirit*, coexisting with the tendencies already noted. "*Cui bono*" is the universal cry. Men hurry—we shall not stop to inquire whether consistently or inconsistently—from their scientific investigations, from their art worshipping, and from their novel reading and sight-seeing, to join in that common cry. This we believe an admitted fact. There is doubtless a true and right noble sense of the word "*useful.*" As man's chief use is to be "the witness of the glory of God, and to advance that glory by his reasonable obedience and resultant happiness, whatever enables him

to fulfil this function is in the noblest and truest sense of the word useful to him." But there is a meaner sense as well. "Things that help us to exist are, in a secondary and mean sense, useful; or rather, if they be looked for alone, they are useless and worse, for it would be better that we should not exist, than that we should guiltily disappoint the purposes of existence." And the present is admitted to be one of those periods when men gravitate toward this lower utility.

Taking up this baser sense of utility, we are ready to ask of everything, What is it worth? Wherein will it aid us? Will it make business easier? Will it help us to run our factories, and dig our canals, and build our railroads, and bridge our rivers, and tunnel our mountains? What will its value be, estimated in "greenbacks?" Even *religion* cannot escape the influence, though with it that influence has doubtless been in the main elevating, in producing a reaction against practical worthlessness. We are acquiring a habit of asking, even of religion, What is its value? Will it make better merchants, and scholars, and mechanics? Will it make truer husbands and wives, better sons and daughters, more faithful friends and neighbours, happier homes? What is it as a working power, affecting the business and bosoms of men? What profit is it? Everywhere, in everything we may note this third tendency, ruling multitudes, and influencing all. It demands and exacts of everything literary, even to the poem and the novel, that it submit to an infusion, in seeming at least, of this demonstrable utility, before it can secure the ear of the great public.

In any ordinary audience these three tendencies are represented, and a threefold requirement is consequently made of the ministrations of the pulpit; first for philosophic and artistic form; secondly, for originality and vividness in presenting God's truth; and thirdly, for an intense practicality. We have no hesitation in pronouncing the exactions of this age greater than any ever before made of God's messengers. To reach, and gain, and mould, and control a mass of men so constituted, the canons of art must not be violated, God's plain truth must be made more telling than man's most highly wrought fiction, and the gospel must somehow be made more deeply and attractively practical than stock speculation, and

banking, and building, and costly and luxurious eating and living. Admitting and insisting upon the mission of the Holy Ghost, still the appalling demand is enough to make the bravest, who at all appreciates it, quail before it, and declare with the gifted but erratic young Robertson, "I would rather lead a forlorn hope than mount the pulpit stairs." Yet he who bears his message in God's name may not shrink from meeting the responsibility, whatever trial or effort it may entail. How, then, shall the task be accomplished?

If we examine their working schemes as distinguished from their rhetorical theories, men, in attempting this task, have made trial of *three methods*, each of which has been determined by predominant or exclusive regard to some one of the three grand tendencies of the times—a regard resulting sometimes from temperament, sometimes from circumstances, and sometimes from bad logic. Sincere and in earnest they have doubtless been in the trial, but the result has been admitted failure, for the simple reason, that God's world is so made that no half truth can win and wield permanent influence over all classes in a community. Men under the influence of the scientific tendency have reasoned thus:—"This is the noblest of these prevailing influences of the age; special heed to it will give us control over the highest class of hearers; we must bring the masses up to our stand-point, rather than descend to theirs." And so, as one-sided things naturally run into extremes, we have had metaphysical disquisitions, and splendid essays, and prose poems—profound and elaborate, but quickening the plain man with no new and telling truth, and making no common heart beat faster by laying magic touch on earnest and noble practical instincts;—we have had our gospel of Philosophy and Æsthetics. Its theory may be very fine; but it has swept the masses out of the church by a logic inevitable as fate:—"If that be the gospel, it is incomprehensible and worthless to us; we don't see how it can elevate or save us; we may as well stay at home;"—and so they have stayed at home, as the complaints and wails of the day attest. Nor has that been all, for this style of presenting God's message has weakened the sense of obligation in the higher classes to whom it has been directed. They have reasoned thus:—"If the gospel

be only a beautiful thing, with nothing living and practical, it is not worth much to us;"—and so they too have stayed at home.

Another class, under the influence of the thirst for novelty, has made chief or exclusive use of this tendency in seeking to accomplish the great task of securing and holding the attention of men. "Here is the way"—so they have reasoned—"of reaching the masses, and of saving the most souls; anything is right in so noble a work; we must go down to men and take advantage of everything that is in them." And so, by the common tendency to extremes, we have had our gospel of "clap-trap" and "twaddle." Religion has thus been made a play, an entertainment, too often a fashionable one, and the church turned into a petty show-house, a theatre, on whose stage the "mysteries and moralities" have been reënacted. The result has been a very natural one; worldly men prefer good acting to bad, Shakespeare's tragedies and comedies to the poor parson's, and a first-class to a tenth-rate theatre.—and so of all other entertainments,—and in the end they have too frequently gone to the genuine play-house, with its cards, billiards, or theatricals; the play-house, which is such without hypocrisy, though its doors open into the pit. The gospel of clap-trap has lamentably failed, and men have felt and acted upon, even where they have not acknowledged, its worthlessness, and the movement, from the highest to the lowest, has been away from, at least, such sanctuaries. A third class has fallen in with utilitarianism, and come under its sway. "It matters neither how true, nor how new, nor how beautiful a thing may be, if it be of no practical value; its practical worth must be clearly seen and laid hold of, and presented most pungently and directly to men." But, as the practical power of God's truth is ordinarily too vast in its workings to be summed up and expressed in figures, and estimated in dollars and cents, the so-called practicality has, from its original one-sidedness, in many cases degenerated into small scolding on subjects of the least possible importance to any human being. And so we have had our gospel of vinegar and wormwood—our Xantippe gospel. Men of taste and culture cannot, and will not endure this; the novelty seekers do not care for it; only small gossiping

people take an interest in such things, and the tide again turns away from the pews.

It needs no argument to demonstrate that none of these methods has accomplished, or ever will accomplish, the great task of reaching, swaying, and saving the multitudes in our Christian lands. Each is partial and one-sided in its assumed principle, and nugatory, if not evil in its results. We must have a working scheme broad enough to take into account all these forces at once, and which shall at once meet the *rightful* demands of all three of these prominent tendencies. Discourse must in some way be made to conform to the highest principles of Art, and yet be neither essay nor poem; to combine novelty with truthfulness, the "things new and old" of Scripture; and to be in the broadest, deepest, truest sense, practical and useful. There are two things which render the present a favourable time for the consideration of the problem thus stated with the view to its correct solution. The first of these is the extensive agitation of the question, "How shall the masses be brought into the sanctuary, attached to it, and saved?" The church sees, as it has never seen before, that it is a vital question, one touching her very existence, and she is naturally anxious to reach a true answer. The other favourable feature, is the reaction that has set in against the extreme and one-sided measures which even earnest men have been disposed to try. The gospel of æsthetics, the gospel of clap-trap, and the gospel of petty scolding, are not the popular things they once were in certain quarters. Common sense and right Christian feeling have revolted against them. Sabbath-schools, that once ran wild over the wares of the quack venders of novelties, now shut out everything of that kind, or meet it, when it is forced upon them, with indignation and loathing. Churches once delighted with the dispensation of toys and gewgaws, have found these very worthless things in the work of building up a permanent congregation, and a vigorous and healthy working membership. But perhaps the most notable feature of the case is the protest against these extremes, which is being made in the religious literature, in the "Schönberg Cotta" books with the realistic element introduced and made prominent, in such volumes as those of Drs. Lowrie and Halsey, and Rev. Messrs.

Breed and Blackburn, published by our Board, and especially in the magazines, of which "Hours at Home" is striving, perhaps under circumstances somewhat adverse, to furnish a type in this country, and of which the "Sunday Magazine" of Dr. Guthrie, and "Sunday at Home," are types in Great Britain, where their marvellous success has demonstrated that Christian people are yet willing and anxious to hear the message that is true as well as the message that is new. These two things, we say, indicate that the present is a favourable time for the consideration of the great problem with the view to its correct solution.

Such then being the characteristics of the times, and such the stage reached in the experiment of solving the grand practical problem of the church, we are prepared to advance a step further in the discussion, and with a view to framing an answer in one degree less general, ask again the question, What is the preaching which shall *meet these determined conditions* of the case? The plain answer, which is neither unchristian, nor unpresbyterian, is *God's truth in its practical bearings must be presented with proper artistic form, and with power, with the grand end of elevating and saving men.* This answer would, we opine, be found not wholly new, if we could take the sense of the thinking, earnest men of the past and present; and yet we trust that when unfolded it will be seen to have enough of the new to fully meet the exigencies of the case. God's truth, in the proper artistic form, will meet the wants of those who have come under the influence of the scientific spirit. God's truth in its grandeur, properly understood, contains the "things new and old"—*new* no less than *old*—with which the wants of the spirit thirsting for newness must be met. God's truth in its practical bearings, is widely and intensely practical enough for the most thorough-going of all sound utilitarians. And the one aim, in the elevation and salvation of men, subordinating everything else to itself and God's glory, furnishes the true principle of unity which will bind all together, and make the work single while it is earnest and hopeful. Altogether it will be found, on comparison, to be substantially the answer which the theory of the books noticed at the beginning of this article offers us. In passing on to the unfolding of the proposition

thus laid down, it follows, that if these considerations accord with truth,

1st. There is *absolute necessity on the part of the clergy for a more correct, complete, and consistent theory of Rhetoric, or the Art of Oratory.* One may study the laws of eloquence solely that he may know them, and in this we shall have *science;* or for the purpose of applying them to any particular product of art that he may estimate it, and in this we shall have a *critique;* or for the purpose of instruction, development and guidance, and in this we shall have *art.* The demand made upon the preacher cannot be properly complied with without a thorough command of Rhetoric in all these relations. Assuredly he ought to have a thorough mastery of the means, the forces, and the principles involved in his sublime work, as well as of how they are to be applied both in criticism and in production. It is our firm belief, that, other things being equal, a man's success, in any sphere, is under God in exact proportion to the correctness of the theory by which he carries forward his work; and we base our judgment on faith in that justice of the Divine government, by virtue of which it is always found on the side of the right, whether it be the right in method or in action. Nor do we hesitate to make strictest application of this rule to the work of the ministry. A God of order cannot delight in disorder in the highest mission assigned to man. *Other things being equal, a man's success in the ministry is in exact proportion to the correctness and completeness of his working theory.* What am I to do? and How and with what am I to do it? are thus vital questions with one sent with a message from God to men. God will never fail to do his part; it is man's to see to it that his be done the best possible.

Leaving out of view those among the clergy who have been led to entertain intelligent and right views of the art of oratory, the remainder naturally fall into *two classes: first*, those who have no theory at all on the subject, and, *secondly*, those who hold only partial theories. Of these in their order.

It requires not even a discerning eye to advise one of the fact, that there are numbers among the clergy who have no theory whatever on the important subject of their mission as God's mouthpieces in the world. We can recall those of our

acquaintance who scoff at all such theories when out of the pulpit, and violate everything that could be rightly embodied in them, when in the pulpit. And in self-defence they are always resurrecting the old and senseless objections to art, and the knowledge of it, that they may confront the advocates of right method with their ghosts. The familiar words of even so distinguished a man as Lord Macaulay, running in a line with the opinions of these objectors, will doubtless occur to any one at all familiar with our English literature. We refer to the passage in his critique on Bacon, in which he rails at rhetoric, logic, and grammar. Macaulay's *practice* is the best refutation of his theory, for in all his writings we find a *studied* adherence to the very principles at which, in this article, he scoffs. To the class with which we are dealing, art is synonymous with *artificial*, or *artful*. They profess to plead for *nature*. "I must be natural,—must speak out and act out my own nature." "But you are rude in manner, awkward in gesture, rough in style, harsh in voice. You ought to practice elocution, and to seek to polish your style." "But it is *my own natural self*. God has made me so, and I must act out myself." And thus the man deliberately persists in uttering what is at once a libel upon his nature and his God,—for he is not at all as God made him, but as man has unmade him,—and what he calls his "own natural self," is most horridly and indefensibly unnatural. Such objections are shorn of all their force to one who has caught even a glimpse of the simple truth, that all perfect art, if not nature, is yet like and consistent with her; and who has come but to suspect that all imperfect art, so far as true, aims at this likeness and consistency. To him everything that falls short of the full likeness and consistency, is, in so far, unnatural and wrong. He finds that the principles of the highest art are merely the interpretation of the plain facts of nature. It is just by the interpretation of the facts of nature, that the true, thinking man, of clear views, comes by his theory of sacred eloquence, and he therefore knows it can be neither artificial nor unnatural. The essential phenomena are before him at the outset. A right theory must take into account and embody all these facts. If, in striving to do this, he adds anything to nature, the result is inconsistency; if from nature he

subtract anything, incompleteness. He is so far true as he adheres to nature. The thing is so simple, that shallow talk about being "artificial" and "unnatural" cannot shake his faith in the slightest.

As we come now to judge of partial theories, held by the second class, above-mentioned, there is need that we pause a moment to contemplate these facts of eloquence, of which we have spoken as patent to all, and to interpret them, in order that we may have the correct and complete as a standard by which to try the incorrect and incomplete. In sacred eloquence we have before us *a soul, in the concrete fulness of its powers and functions, possessed by God's truth and Spirit, expressing itself by means of appropriate language, to move and save other souls constituted like itself.* Here is first, and on either side, *a soul*, in the fulness of its powers, *i. e.*, mind, heart, will, taste, conscience—all these. A soul expressing itself, or a soul moved, involves all these. Then this soul is *under the controlling influence of God's truth and Spirit.* That lifts its activity out of the sphere of the purely human and natural, and makes the man a Divine messenger. Then you have the fit instrument of expression, *appropriate language*, articulate and inarticulate, including speech, tone, look, gesture, in short, whatever in the orator aids expression. And, lastly, the one grand aim, *to move and save souls.* These are the facts, as any one may read them for himself. Theories of pulpit eloquence which fail to take into account any of these facts must be partial, one-sided, so far wrong. The test is simple; let us try some of them.

"*Preaching*," says one, "*is the presentation of theological truth.*" If in his practice he hold firmly and consistently to his theory in its ordinary acceptation, a sermon with him becomes a theological essay. He evidently has a truth in his scheme, but it is only a partial truth, not even a half truth. He has omitted the essential aim of preaching, forgotten the Divine mission, and somehow substituted an *intellect* for a soul. Perhaps, if he has ever suspected man possessed of heart, will, taste, and conscience, he has summarily reached the conclusion that these are never affected except through cold, logical presentation of truth to the understanding, and that they have no

reciprocating or reacting power. And by the phrase, "*presentation of truth*," such theorists too often mean, simply putting it into logical and grammatical formulas, which are intelligible to the speaker himself, and to educated, thinking men, but either unintelligible or forceless to the plain man. To them *expression* exhausts the meaning of their theory. We protest that expression is not the whole of oratory. The expression of truth characterizes Philosophy; the expression of æsthetic truth, the Fine Arts; but oratory is set apart from both these by the fact that it not only expresses but *transfers* truth. Before the preacher has fulfilled his mission, the theological truth must be put in fit words; into these must be breathed the quickening power of right feeling, deep moral purpose and intense spirituality; and then this living whole must be pressed home with all the art and force of outward eloquence until that truth of God, in its clearness, completeness, warmth, and life, is left lodged in the soul of the hearer. The actual transfer of God's truth to other souls is essential to a proper oratorical presentation, and every effort which falls short of that, is, so far as the highest aim of oratory is concerned, a failure. And yet, narrow as is this view which is satisfied with mere expression in language, it is amazing to how large an extent it is the working theory in the pulpit. We once heard a sermon after this pattern, which treated of the whole subject of the Future State of God's children, answering the questions: "What is heaven?" "What of heavenly recognition?" &c., &c., quoting three or four poems, the whole discourse occupying precisely twenty minutes. We are certain that the man had never dreamed of one thing that belongs distinctively to the sermon. We grant this an extreme case, but many a discourse is constructed after a like model, and, as is always the case, the mightier the logic of the man who works after such incomplete pattern, the more rigidly does he adhere to it. The partial truth that gives this view its power over certain minds, is, that man has an intellect to which the preacher must impart the knowledge of God's word. An important truth it is admitted to be; the great, we had almost said, fatal error, is in supposing it the whole truth.

Reacting against this view, another class holds that *preach-*

ing is moving the religious feelings of men by any means whatsoever. If one of this opinion hold firmly by it in his practice, a sermon with him may possibly rise to the dignity of an *exhortation.* There is evidently some truth in his notion, but only a modicum. Instruction is of the least possible importance in his scheme. God's word is of no worth where a good story or a telling gesture will compass his end better. In place of a soul, in all the fulness of its powers, he puts the emotional part of man's nature,—and that often not the heart in its entireness, taking in those states of feeling which may be as lasting as the soul itself, but the fitful, fleeting passion of a moment, neither deep enough nor permanent enough to affect the life. The writer once listened, for a month or two, to the daily ministrations of the late noted Rev. John Newland Maffit, a most admirable illustration of this method. Any one who ever heard him can recall the "start and stare theatric," the moving, sentimental story, the thousand little things in style and voice and gesture, fitted and intended to arouse the feelings of his audience, and any one who ever watched the progress of his plot to its denouement, will readily recognize in him a complete specimen of the man who thinks it to be his mission to move the religious feelings by any means whatever. The truth which gives this theory all its power, is, that man has a heart which is to be moved and affected; the great and almost fatal error is in supposing that this is all.

Passing over the multitudinous variations of opinion, each of which has its truth, great or little, as the case may be, we find one thing more deserving special notice—the theory that *no definite rules or principles are needed by the pulpit orator.* It may appear inconsistent to call such a view a *theory*, when, on its very face it professes to discard all theories. Nevertheless, it does, in fact, seek to make a theory of its no-theory. We have seen elaborate articles in the "Quarterlies" advocating it. "Let us have freedom for genius," is its cry—"Away with your formal divisions; they hamper us"—"Down with your formal rules; man is a law to himself"—"Out with your stereotyped forms; they are the dead letter which killeth"—"Give us the largest license." Unfortunately, it is seldom genius that utters the cry; ordinarily it is mediocrity—some-

times honest, industrious mediocrity—but mediocrity still. If it be a man of mark, it is ordinarily raised in reference to something of which he knows but little. The literary world has had, in another department, a recent illustration of the truth of these assertions, in the Dean of Canterbury's absolution of himself from the shackles of English grammatical rules, while undertaking to be an authoritative teacher of the "Queen's English." "The Dean's English" has demonstrated than no one had more need than Dean Alford himself to be taught these rules, and to be guided in the practice of them. This is but one case of the million. And yet there is a value in this view if it be considered as a reaction against a cold, rigid, dead formality, with which too many are familiar. It has its admitted truth, *that freedom is necessary to power;* but it forgets that it is only a freedom under and in accordance with God's laws. The Divine government, in every sphere, gives room for the very largest freedom that is consistent with the good of the creature. Man is a free being, though gravitation binds him down to the earth, and one may well doubt if he would be any freer or any better off if there were in some way given him the power to run up the sky against gravitation. If there is one thing evident to a thinking man, it is that freedom of discourse can never be reached by casting away the experience of ages, defying all the principles found in human nature, and running counter to all the laws of God's world. In truth, such freedom and variety can only be secured when working under a system of rules as broad and complete as the facts of nature which centre in eloquence. These principles will always admit and prepare the way for perfect freedom and infinite variety, with the same ease with which a few ultimate chemical elements prepare for the variety of that vast realm of nature in which the great Maker never repeats himself. It is not the sermon but the man that becomes stereotype; and no taking of divisions out of the sermon will remedy that. What is needed is not freedom *from* rules, but freedom *under* rules; and this only comes by those ways, so hard to human nature—by agony of soul and sweat of brow; or, to express it in less formidable, because more familiar and less weighed, phrase, which yet at bottom contains the same terrible meaning—*by*

knowledge and practice. Freedom without rule, at the first license, becomes, in its progress, the dullest of formality, and ends in the unhelpful liberty of the sweeping dust—utter dissolution.

Such a survey of the field we have been traversing, with the application of the proper test to these partial theories, has prepared for the reaffirmation, with increased emphasis, of the necessity of a thorough knowledge, on the part of the pulpit orator, both of what is to be done and how it is to be done; or, in other words, of the absolute need of a more correct, complete, and consistent theory of sacred eloquence. At the very outset of his work (pages 51 and 52 of the trans.) Dr. Theremin insists upon this necessity. After stating it to be his design to construct and present such a system, he proceeds to meet the common objection drawn from the success of Greek and Roman eloquence, achieved without such a system, by demonstrating that the dependence of life, influence, wealth, and freedom, upon success or failure in an oration, called forth men's powers to the fullest, and led them to avoid faults which would prove fatal, so taking the place of the most rigid system, and often more than compensating for it; and then showing that the absence of these conditions in the present renders the strictest system indispensable. We question the rightfulness of the admission, that Demosthenes and Cicero reached the highest perfection by practice, without the aid of any rhetorical system; but, granting that, Dr. Theremin's reasoning is conclusive. Professor Shedd, too, in his admirable Introductory Essay, eloquently enforces the same necessity by other and different arguments.

Taking into account all the elements properly entering into the discussion:—the shortcoming of the theories, and the practical evil resulting from it; the necessity of right views in order to the most successful work; the state of science and art to which the century has brought us; and the imperative demand made by the thinking and cultivated portion of society, for artistic excellence in the presentation of God's truth; the need which has been affirmed must, we think, be admitted. The principles at the foundation of this conclusion are simple. If a mechanic, working blindly, cannot do worthy work, then an

artist, in the sublimest of arts, cannot blindly do noble work. Give him the light of true principle for his guidance. If a theory, wrong in its principles, is inevitably wrong in its operation, then let no man, in the highest sphere of effort, where every word is trembling with destinies immortal, attempt to deliver God's message with such a theory. Let him right the wrong. If the progress of science has made an Art of Oratory possible, then let not him who is sent to be an orator for Jehovah think to work acceptably to the Master, or successfully, without systematic knowledge of it. Give him all that may be known, to use in his great mission. If there is a right and sure method of reaching, holding, and swaying the thinking, educated men of the country by the truth of God, let no messenger of God scoff at or neglect that method. Give him the mastery of it. By rightly becoming "all things to all men," some will assuredly be saved. It is preëminently the duty of the times to fail not to ascertain, at the outset, the correct method of doing God's work; He will honour just that, and, other things being equal, crown it, alone and above all, with the largest and most notable success.

2dly. In accordance with the general answer already given to the question under consideration, the practice of the pulpit must be conformed to right theory, and to the wants of the times, so as *to present God's truth in its practical bearings, and with freshness and vividness.* To consider *matter* and *form*, in the respects herein involved apart from each other—

(1.) The *matter* of the preaching for these times must be, at the foundation, God's truth in its great practical bearings. *God's truth* first of all. It is admitted that the *methods* of one age are never precisely suited to the wants of another; but God's truth, in its relation to man's necessities, is unchangeable. We, therefore, confess to no sympathy with the tendency of Professor Draper and the neologizers of his school, who seem almost desirous, in their profound admiration for the physical sciences, to substitute the truth of nature for the truth of God's word in the training of the Theological Seminary, and in the deliverances of the pulpit. It is true, that in order to be best fitted for any great mission, a man should have attained to that kind and degree of culture which will

insure to him right and complete views of every department in nature, as well as in art, and in the higher sphere of theology, but that is farthest possible from justifying the claims which the distinguished Professor puts forward in his recent work entitled, "The Future Civil Policy of America," for either the predominance, or the exclusive use of the physical sciences, in even the preliminary training of the clergy. We protest against such a view, and, while we humbly bow before him in his own department, fearlessly affirm the incapacity of Professor Draper to decide what is the need of the clergy, and to mark out the course by which they must be prepared for their work. We base our protest—first, upon *natural unfitness;* for, as a general rule, no mere mathematician or scientist is capable of forming a correct judgment concerning the great issues of the higher world of spirit. The constant repetition of the intellectual process involved in the reasoning with necessary truth, that $2+2+2=6$, or that the known and measured forces $a+b+c=d$, does not prepare a mind for moving with ease and certainty in that region, where, in dealing with contingent truth, the spiritual forces combining the known and measured with the unknown and unmeasured, give us $a+x+y+$&c. $=z$. We base our protest—secondly, on evident prejudice and want of knowledge in the premises as incapacitating Professor Draper; for no one who could write one sentence, which occurs in the book above referred to, (page 277,) and which we quote, can pretend to have mastered the facts requisite for the formation of a judgment in such a matter. Speaking of the opposition of the leaders in religion to science, Professor Draper says:—"The result of this condition of things is, that many of the most important, the most powerful and exact branches of human knowledge, have been forced into a position they never would have voluntarily assumed, and have been compelled to put themselves on their defence. Astronomy, in the case of the globular form of the earth, and its position as a subordinate planet; Geology, as respects its vast antiquity; Zoölogy, on the problem of the origin of species; Chemistry, on the unchangeability of matter, and the indestructibility of force." We submit that when both are rightly understood, there is no conflict between the doctrines

of religion and the results of the investigations of *true* science.

The truth of science has its value, which we would by no means underrate, and we hail all knowledge of it as a gift of God, but nature has no revelation of *salvation* to make to sinners; *that*, the one thing essential, is *supernatural*. If the church of God has one living conviction, it is this, that nothing but the revealed truth of God's word can save men. God himself affirms this much. God's truth, then, first of all, and above all. And yet, guarding against another extreme, we are far from having anything like full sympathy with that tendency of mind which would reduce God's word, as presented from the pulpit, to lifeless intellectual theory or dry abstraction. The Bible is an intensely practical book. There are certain great questions which no thinking man can fail to ask himself,—Whence came I? Upon whom can I depend? Whence the evil in the world? Is there any way of escape? What is that way? Guizot, in his "Meditations on Christianity," in demonstrating that the Bible, in its doctrines of Creation, Providence, Original Sin, Incarnation, and Redemption, furnishes the only correct and satisfying answer to these questions, has at the same time brought out the essence of God's word, and shown how prominent a thing is its perfect adaptation to our human wants. These questions have to do, principally, not with man's imaginations, not with his logic, good or bad, not with his taste, rude or cultivated, but with life and death. The Bible appeals to practical instincts, is adapted to practical needs, proposes to meet practical issues, puts its truth in concrete, practical shapes. Preaching which does not appeal to such practical instincts, which does not supply such pressing needs, which does not meet such living issues, which does not put itself in such direct and forcible shape, cannot be according to the standard of God's word. *Its* truth is no dead orthodoxy, but a living and life-giving thing. Not abstract didactic theology, but God's truth, as the Bible presents it, must be the matter of the pulpit in these days. The preacher who is satisfied with the bald statement, and theological or scriptural demonstration of a doctrine, closed up with, "This is an important truth," is not fulfilling his mission. His hearers

would probably admit all that beforehand. But "science, falsely so-called," and reason, better called unreason, we admit, have their cavils and objections, and these are real troubles to him, and to meet these he seeks aid from the pulpit. If it affords it not, it leaves him to grope on in the dark. Didactic theology is, so to speak, the skeleton, which must be clothed with living tissues, and have infused the vital fluids, and inbreathed the breath of God, before it can be a power in our world. The rightful demands of men, and of a correct theory of oratory, can only be satisfied by *God's truth in its practical bearings.*

But there is need of more specific statement in unfolding what is meant by this. The *aim of gospel preaching* is usually stated to be *the saving of sinners and the edification of saints.* As these are only different aspects of the one work of salvation, and are both accomplished through the instrumentality of substantially the same truth, the statement may be properly varied, provided the essence of the matter be retained. It may be rightly said, then, that the aim of the message of the servant of God is to lead to the conversion of men, to develop Christian activity, and to direct the Christian work in the divinely constituted relations of the world in which it must be carried on,—and it may be taken for granted that, in order to adapt itself to this aim, the appropriate message from God must be directed to the soul from that side from which it is possible, humanly speaking, to move it. The preaching for this practical age must take into special account all these things, and, so far as the tendency to practicalness is concerned, the success of the pulpit will depend upon giving wise heed to them. Moreover, it becomes evident at once, that while all revealed truth is to be proclaimed to men, according to the proportion of faith, there are yet, so to speak, *certain centres of crystallization* around which that truth gathers, and in subordination to which it is to be set forth.

The first aim of the gospel is *to lead to the conversion of men*, or to lead them to faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The preaching which, under God, is to attain this end, must, therefore, first of all and chiefly, present the grand converting doctrine of God's word, "Christ crucified." Salvation is by belief in

Jesus Christ and reliance upon him, not as a teacher, not as a sufferer, not as a martyr, but as *the Divinely-appointed and Divine-human substitute for sinners.* Take this doctrine out of the Bible, and all that is distinctive, all that is fundamental, all that is saving, is gone. It is not merely some abstract conception of the perfection of the Saviour's character, or of the beauty of his life, or of the sublimity of his teachings, or of the glory of the throne to which he is exalted as Mediator,—not any or all of these that it pleases the Holy Ghost to use chiefly in the conversion of sinners. *Christ dying for our sins* is the converting doctrine of the gospel, and while all the rest must be preached, it must be with constant reference to this, and with constant aim to impress this. All must be preached in this, and this in all. The being and nature of God and the lost condition of man are to be unfolded—the law is to be preached in all its length and breadth, and with all its terrors, and every possible motive to be plied, but this with the view of bringing the sinner to a sense of his need of Christ, and to acceptance of him. Christ crucified for the sinner, and presented with a view to his salvation, is thus the first centre of crystallization.

But man is *to become a worker for God,* or as Scripture has it, a co-worker with Him. To lead him to this is the second aim of the preacher. In all true and complete religious development, Christianity must appear not only as a saving doctrine, but also as a life. In an age preëminently demanding action, with dead churches all around them, it should need no argument to convince the leading men that special attention must be directed to this phase of religious culture. The question, How shall men be converted to God? is not more intensely practical than the question, How shall the energies of the Christian church be brought out and gathered up, and directed most powerfully and efficiently to this end of the world's salvation? Now the logic of Christian living, aside from the power of the Holy Ghost, is eminently simple: "Christ has lived and died for me, therefore, I will live and die for him," or as Paul puts it, "The love of Christ constraineth us." The doctrine of the cross, as unfolding the heart of God to men, must be preached in such a way as to

deepen and call forth this sense of obligation, and lead to that work for want of more of which the generations are perishing. The ruin of the world, the mission of the church to save it, the agencies by which this is to be accomplished, right methods of work for the heathen at home and abroad, with the progress and prospects, individual responsibility in the matter, must be constantly set forth, and the appeals in view of them made urgent and irresistible by the application of the power of Christ's constraining love, until we have a church which, by adding works to its faith, shall demonstrate that faith to be living and not dead. All must be preached through this and this in all. The doctrine of the cross in its relations to Christian activity, is thus a second centre of crystallization.

But Christian believing and working are *to be done in the world as it is*, in connection with its Divinely ordained institutions. Here are three great Divine institutions, the Family, the Church, and the State; the Family and the State as truly of Divine ordaining as the Church; the State appointed to embrace all men; the Church to embrace all Christian men; and the Family the kernel of the State and the type of the Church. The Christian is not an abstraction, but a being living in all these relations, and therefore needing direction in them all. God's law—not some human law—reaches and claims supremacy over him in all these positions. There is a profound and, we hold, scriptural truth, bearing on this point, and one to which this generation needs to give special heed, brought out most powerfully by Julius Müller, in his "Christian Doctrine of Sin," in the brief passage in which he insists that man is not a *legislator*, that is, a justice-maker or a law-maker, in the strict sense, but simply, under God, who has himself made the justice and ordained the law, a *law-discerner* and *law-proclaimer*. That truth sweeps away the popular ideas, "man a law to himself," "the church a mere voluntary association," "the people sovereign." God in Christ is the head of all, and God's word the law of all. Now God's word as the law of conduct is not the rule of some abstract man, but of the man in the Family, Church, and State. The minister of God is the only and authorized expounder of this law as it applies to all these relations, and to man in them. It is not simply his *privilege*, con-

ceded by sufferance, but his *solemn duty* to bring that law to bear in all these aspects, and thus make God's own word the moulder of sentiment in all the relations of life. We believe the future progress of salvation in the church will depend very much upon her recognition and appreciation of this her position and her duty. The whole tendency of our national history has been toward putting God's messengers and his word out of their rightful place. Reaction in the early history against much-abused authority has, in the end, run into impatience of all authority, even that which only aims to check the evil. The assumption of political demagogues, and of pulpit demagogues, just as truly in the interests of evil; the vulgar outcry against preaching the moral and Christian principles that should control politics and statesmanship; and the gross ultraisms of many who assume to be models in this sort of preaching, seemed to finish the work of divorcing the Christian man and preaching from all practical connection with the world, and thus to leave great vital issues to work themselves out with no proper guidance, and to spread ruin, individual, social, ecclesiastical, and national, everywhere. It is matter for rejoicing that the terrible experience of the past few years has done much to open the eyes of the clergy, and to rouse them to a sense of their responsibility as God's watchmen, and to reinstate them in their true position. The present and the coming years demand application, plain, forcible, constant, such as the past has not known, of God's word, to all the relations of life, for, after sowing the wind, we are reaping the whirlwind,—in the family, in new theories of marriage and divorce, of the obedience and service of children, and all that,—in the church, in independency and lawlessness, in the clogging of right work by the multiplication of voluntary associations outside of the church, and controlled too often by irresponsible and unfit men,—and in the state—God save the state! Practical direction, out of God's word, in all these positions in which he is a believer and worker, the Christian must especially have in this age in which the old landmarks are being removed. The law of God in its application to the social, civil, and ecclesiastical spheres of duty, is another of the centres of crystallization.

Once more, all this truth of God, whether it have in view

the conversion of men, the development of Christian activity, or direction in duty, must be addressed to, what are called by Dr. Theremin, *the practical ideas*. The truth must somehow be brought into living connection with the soul to which it is addressed. Now, by virtue of his constitution, "every man ideally (though, by reason of his sin, not actually) wills the perfect." "Every man wills the perfect, in so far as it is specifically determined and conditioned by his peculiar relations; this is the idea of *duty*. Every man wills to be inclined and able to realize the perfect at all times, and everywhere; this is the idea of *virtue*. Every man wills that each and every one of his actions result in a series of internal and external consequences that will render the realization of the perfect ideal easier for him in future; this is the idea of *happiness*." ("*Eloquence a Virtue*," page 74.) Here is the side from which, oratorically, he may and must be approached. Show him that a thing is duty, and you have at once a friend within his soul to aid you. Show him that a thing is due to his *manliness*, and you have another friend within. Connect a thing inseparably with his *happiness*, and you have another answering voice. These times call for powerful addresses to these practical ideas. It is one of the pressing necessities. By departure from it, preaching has lost much of its *authority*, as well as much of its power. God's word, especially as coming from the lips of Christ himself, lays tremendous stress on all of these ideas, even to that one of *woe*, from which the tremulous delicacy and subtle pride of this age so shrink away. Success will be won in these days only by fearlessly following in the footsteps of Jesus of Nazareth.

It is an absolute necessity that the preaching of the day should take on more of this practical shape as to its matter. What meets no living want will never reach man, for he is, after all, a practical being, and will never travel very far out of his way for that which can clearly be of no use to him. Speculate and abstract till you take all the soul and life out of God's word, and he no longer wants it. The mightiest in moving power have always taken advantage of the wonderful common sense of the race, and made the most of it; but somehow we of the pulpit in this day are slow to believe fallen men

endowed with common sense and practicalness. We have heard the broad statement made from the pulpit, and that by those credited with being thinking men, that the work of the preacher is unlike any other in the world, in that the operation of the principles of cause and effect, and of adaptation of means to end has no place in it. Against this we plead, not for a rationalizing, much less a rationalistic, view, but for a rational one; and we hold that nothing in God's universe is so perfectly adapted to the end designed as that gospel of Christ which is confessedly the highest revelation of his wisdom. While God is admitted sovereign, we deem it demonstrable, that, in the ordinary administration of that sovereignty, the results of right work when done in the pulpit are not as uncertain as men seem to think. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." God has presented just what will save man, provided he will comply with the divine conditions. He has done nothing more in any sphere. It would be madness to say that He who has provided redemption at such a cost, takes less interest in the saving of souls than in the ordinary work of men. Dependence for the results is here upon the direct and supernatural power of God, secured in his promise to faith; and the man who does not wish to cast away faith will hardly claim that God's promise and direct power are less a dependence than the so-called laws of nature. The difficulty is, that, in our worldly wisdom, we have too often mistaken man, emasculated the gospel, and distrusted God;—*mistaken man*, thinking him a fool or a puppet, to be interested by sleight-of-hand performances, rather than a being once made in God's image, and having still intense and earnest gazings upward toward the skies, and ceaseless though undefined longings for something higher;—*emasculated the gospel*, vainly imagining that which appeals to the lower and perishing instincts mightier than that which reaches down after what is enduring and godlike in him; *distrusted God*, in that we have wanted confidence in that way of bearing life to men which He has declared to be the embodiment of His highest wisdom. One thing that we of this age must learn anew, and in its full significance, is, that these practical things, which have to do with the conversion of men, with the growth of Christian activity, and the direction in duty in

the world, and which appeal to man's highest instincts, have not yet lost their power. They must be used more constantly and mightily in our preaching if we are to expect great results in the Master's service. The gospel is just what man needs; holding this, we need to preach it as if we believed it. Man, by nature, does not appreciate it; admitting this, we yet need to preach it as if he did, for God has promised to make it a light to the blind. We cannot save men; acknowledging this, with all humility, we must yet, in some sort, preach it as if, under God, we could; for God can save, and has promised to do it. The preaching whose matter shall be such, cannot but be a power in the world, gaining the ear of the perishing multitudes, and, by God's grace, saving their souls.

(2.) Passing from matter to manner, it is obvious that in respect of form the preaching for these times must be *with freshness and vividness, or with power.*

Prof. Day has given a most admirable compendium of the essential qualities of a good style, under the head of "Objective Properties of Style." First, Clearness, as truth must be intelligible in order to be felt; secondly, Energy, as truth must possess vividness in order to reach and stir men; thirdly, Elegance, as what offends against good taste will not readily gain access to men even though it be clear and powerful. There is no other discussion of the principles of style at all comparable with it in the English language, and we therefore commend it to any one who may be desirous of clear guidance in this regard. The course of the present discussion does not lie in the same line with Prof. Day's treatise, as our aim is not to deal with the general qualities of style, but merely to call attention to certain special principles which have to do with adapting the style of the pulpit to the wants of the age, and making it more a power with men.

In attaining that freshness and vividness for which Simplicity prepares, there are, aside from the general laws of Energy, certain special principles which enter more or less into the style of the powerful preachers of all times as an element in winning success, and which, while most important always, are especially a necessity to the pulpit of the present. They

may be denominated Biblical qualities. To enumerate, in brief, some of them.

First: The word of God must be presented *more in concrete form.* The idea, apparently of so many, that the preacher's chief mission is to turn his text into abstract truth, with which to ply a sleepy congregation, is all wrong. However necessary this process of abstraction for the purposes of systematic theology, it is not the Bible method of reaching men. There was never a truer utterance than that of Coleridge, in one of his introductory aphorisms in his "Aids to Reflection:" "To restore a common-place truth to its first uncommon lustre, you need only translate it into action." What we can *see* has power. The Sacrament of the Supper takes advantage of this principle, and embodying the central truth of the gospel, addresses it to reason and faith with the added power of the senses. It is thus the most powerful of all presentations of the doctrine of the cross. And accordingly we find Scripture everywhere presenting its truth largely in living shape and relation, in history and individual experience and incident, so attaining to a perpetual freshness and interest. The pulpit of a day in which the world presents everything in the concrete, needs to model after the Bible in this regard. Volumes on faith in the abstract can never so unfold its nature to the masses of men, as will the exposition of that master example in Abraham's offering of Isaac. Volumes on parental responsibility in the abstract can never so fix the idea in the hearts of men in all its fulness as will that terribly solemn example of a pious father's grief over a favourite son gone down to perdition through his agency, which is brought before us in David's lament over his son Absalom. For our instruction and guidance God's word has put its utterances in these forceful shapes, and we may find in it instances without number, applicable to every possible phase of life, whether in its faith and work or in its relations to family, state, and church. Here is one of the powers which God has put into the hands of the clergy to be used in their mission, and it is preëminently the demand of this age, as well as of human nature, that it be used.

Secondly, God's truth must be presented, as is the Bible manner, *with apt and ample illustration.* Ruskin, (in Part III.,

Vol. II., of "Modern Painters,") has drawn out that noble theory which affirms of all inherent beauty that it is typical of the Divine attributes. It is a magnificent thing in the metaphysical profundity of its conception, no less than in the marvellous felicity of its delineation. We believe this the only true basis of a correct art-theory. Apply the same principle to the world of fact and truth, as well as beauty, and you have a new element of power in the pulpit. The world in which we live, in its men, in its relations, in its material aspects, becomes typical of the higher, spiritual world. As the tabernacle was fashioned after the heavenly temple, so the lower world after the higher. Not simply and arbitrarily illustrative is the world, therefore, but, to the deep and right-seeing eye, *typical*, and therefore illustrative. It is, so to speak, God's first great book for men, containing the foundations for all other revelations, and without which they could not have been—the "Dark Mirror," (*Modern Painters*, Part IX., Chap. i., in Vol. V.,) in which man must catch his first faint glimpses of God and heaven. "Tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, sermons in stones," is no longer the merest fancy of the poet, but the statement of veritable fact. There is a power akin to concrete presentation of the truth, and here is furnished the clue to the mystery and force of figurative language: God has written all higher truth in some lower form, which brings it within our reach. A figure, used in illustrating, has power because it presents the very truth illustrated, as God has given it in simple and concrete shape. This principle is of value not because of Ruskin, but because of God, for we hold this to be the Biblical way of viewing things. The Bible makes everything typical. The soul in all its faculties and life, the family in all its relations and experiences, the nation in all its constitution and history, the church in all its ordinances and triumphs, the earth and the material universe in all its breadth of fact and form, of change and growth, it brings before us to teach us of God and heaven, and the higher things, giving us in this wise our first glimpses of the spiritual realities and glories. One can scarcely conceive of anything that is not so used in the Bible. It is one of the secrets of the wonderful energy and perpetual freshness of style, in which it surpasses

all other and merely human books. And it stands out clearly as a power to be used in the pulpit. We deal too freely in far-fetched and much elaborated figures, which we make for ourselves, and with which we vainly think to illustrate in arbitrary way what God has uttered for us. Such work is like all work purely of man, and after his pattern, forceless and lifeless. What this age preëminently wants is the seeing eye, the quick-discerning mind, and then, turning this down into the soul, or to the household life, or out upon the world, God will make revelations of himself to us, with which we may enforce his higher truths,—and He will make them everywhere, in the flying leaf, the vanishing vapor, and the sweeping dust, in the falling sparrow, the short-lived moth, and the blooming and fading flower, in the yearnings of a father over his wandering son, the watchings of a mother over her helpless babe, and the heavenliness of home. So seeing, we shall no longer hear man's illustration, but God's, and men will unconsciously recognize in it something of God's power. Taking art and science by the hand, as aids and guides in this their sphere, religion must make the world, with all in it, tributary to the pulpit, and make full use of it, until the message of wrath and love is written, as the Bible would write it, on everything that meets man's eye, appeals to his reason, dwells in his memory, fastens to his hopes, moves his heart, and links itself with his life. Such preaching will be a power with man. In the end, the distilling dew shall, from morn to morn, speak to him of the silence, the energy, the quickening, invigorating contact, and the wide-reaching influence of God's proclaimed message; the flaming course of the morning sun as it hastens to its meridian splendour shall show him daily the "path of the just" drawn across the skies, in its beginnings out of darkness, in its light dispelling the darkness, and calling forth the life of the world, in its constant progress, and in its reaching out toward perfection; and the fading leaf sweeping across the sky, while it speaks to him of his own withering life, shall tell him of accumulated work and imperishable monument left behind for the coming generations.

Thirdly: Another element of power is to be found in the presentation of *the specific truths of God's word.* We deal too

much in these days in generalities. It is all wrong. Such truths, from their very nature, can possess comparatively little interest. And they are few in number; the man who deals in them must soon either exhaust or repeat himself. Moreover, it is not the Bible way, for in it everything is specific. The one who holds fast by the precise truth of each text of Scripture will always be new, because, unlike general truth, specific truth is infinite. Over each text a vital question is, "What is the exact thing that God would teach in this passage?" The man who always asks it, and always presents what he ascertains as its answer, will not present the same subject in connection with all kindred texts, and will preach neither abstract theology nor philosophy, but God's word, which is better than either or both. Here, by way of illustration, are two texts:—"By Him all things consist"—"O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." We have heard men preach on the same general doctrine of providence from both of them. It was not preaching God's word. The first of the texts has nothing to say of providence in general; it only speaks of one element in the doctrine of providence—*preservation*, and is still more specific in affirming this not of God absolute, but of Jesus Christ. "By Christ all things are continued in being." The other text is still more specific in another direction. The emphatic words—at least in significance—are, "in man," "in himself;" and the theme from it, in its relations to providence, would be the prophet's thorough conviction of the necessity of a special providence as demonstrated to him *by the nature of man*. Again, here are three texts: Psalm lxii. 11—"God hath spoken once; twice have I heard this; that power belongeth unto God." Psalm iii. 6—"He hath showed his people the power of his works, that he may give them the heritage of the heathen." Jeremiah v. 22—"Fear ye not me?" saith the Lord; "will ye not tremble at my presence, which have placed the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass it; and though the waves thereof toss themselves, yet can they not prevail; though they roar, yet can they not pass over it?" One might preach on the power of God from them all, but that would by no means bring out their

truth. Taking them only in their applications to the present, the *first* points rather to the abundant and clear evidence that power is God's prerogative;—the *second* may turn our attention to the wonderful manner in which, by the progress of science and art, God is unfolding the powers of nature to the Christian nations, and making way for the possession and conversion of the world;—while the *third* speaks not specifically of the power of God, nor of the power of God to control, nor of the power of God to control the mightiest things, nor of the power of God to control the mightiest things by the most insignificant means, but of the power of God to control the mightiest forces by the most insignificant means, as a reason why the sinner should fear him,—or, in more rhetorical form, the omnipotence of the most insignificant things in God's hands as a reason for the sinner's fearing him. The three run in wholly different lines of thought:—*One* takes us out through the universe, and bids us listen for the voices of God's power everywhere, from man's soul to the sweep of the remotest star; *another* takes us along the experience of Christendom, and shows us how the forces of nature, in wind, steam, magnetism, electricity, in all their application to the arts, to trade and intercourse, are being revealed to the Christian nations, and being used to bring the heathen to their very door for a possession for the church and Christ:—and the *third* takes us to the storm-lashed shore, and to where the minute and mysterious forces of God's vast world are working out in silence the behests of his omnipotence, and bids us sinners tremble as we see how God can hold for ages those furious and seemingly resistless waves by that shifting sand, while the adamantine rocks wear away and disappear,—how He can grind up the mountains by the turn of atoms, bind the proudest with the web of the spider, take his life with a particle of dust or air, or crush him by the turning of a falling autumn leaf. While we do not intend to recommend some forms of expository preaching as suited to this age of cheap commentaries, yet specific truth we must have, as an element of power in the pulpit, even though it carry us all the way back to simple exposition, for that is better than generalities, however glittering, and as much better as God's word is better than man's generalizations. We must

learn to come to a text, not to see whether it may be warped to suit our purposes, but to ascertain what God says in it, and then to present and enforce that from the pulpit.

Such, in hasty sketch, must the preaching of this day be in *matter* and *form* to meet the demands of the times. The pulpit must hold up the practical truth of God in concrete shape, illustrated in God's way, and specific as in God's word. The theoretical, the abstract, the indefinite, the general, have no living energy. The practical, the concrete, the illustrated, the specific, alone are ever new, and fresh, and forceful, and fitted to take living hold on human souls.

As we turn a passing glance to those who hold and control men, we find them clearly possessed, in large measure, of at least some of these elements, and wielding influence according to the completeness of their furnishing. Two men stand out before us as the popular men of the day in the pulpit, with reputation world-wide—we refer to the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon and Henry Ward Beecher. It was long the custom to call in question the power of these men, but the day is gone when one can exclaim "clap-trap" with a sneer, and pass them by. The fact of substantial and permanent success meets us face to face. "Clap-trap" may attract the crowd for a twelvemonth, but it has no power to hold it through the years. It is wiser to acknowledge the facts, and, while guarding against error, seek to make the most of that power, whatever it may be, by which they have won success. Spurgeon and Beecher stand before the world as the most successful pulpit orators of the day. Wherein lies their power? Holding fast the distinction of matter and form, we should say that, in the particulars we have enumerated, Spurgeon's success is due more to the *matter*, Beecher's more to the *form*, though each possesses, in some degree, all the elements, both in matter and form. Taking Coleridge's antithesis between science and poetry, Mr. Beecher's cast of mind is rather poetic than scientific. This accounts for some of his peculiarities. If he has any system of theology, it is one peculiar to himself, so that, taking him in connection with his family, the division of theologians into "the orthodox, the heterodox, and the Beecher family," is more than a witticism. As a result of this laxness and want

of system, we find him often sneering at "orthodoxy" and sound theology, and disparaging some of the truths most precious to the church of God, a feature in his preaching that we deeply deplore. Spurgeon, on the other hand, has his most clearly defined system of theology. In the presentation of the *practical truth* of God we find a marked difference in the two men. Spurgeon dwells more than Beecher upon the doctrine of the cross in its relations to the conversion of men, and the development of Christian activity. The number of conversions under his ministry is therefore greater, and the distinctively Christian activity of his church more noteworthy. Beecher dwells more than Spurgeon upon the duties of the Christian believer and worker in the spheres of *social and civil duty*, applying the truth more to the everyday home-wants of men, seeking to guide them in the world as it is, aiming to make them better fathers, relatives, and friends, better business men and citizens. No man of the day attempts to apply God's word to these practical connections of the Christian with the world, especially in the national sphere, as does Beecher, often radically and wrongly, to be sure, but yet, we are constrained to concede, with an aim to faithfulness, and, on the whole, presenting vital truth, which lays hold of human hearts, and makes him a moulder of public sentiment, and a leader among men. Both address their messages to the *practical ideas* in man, but Spurgeon, the more powerfully, speaking chiefly to duty and happiness, and appealing to the latter from its darker side with a tremendous and awful intensity of earnestness which has never been surpassed since Jesus of Nazareth uttered his proclamations of woe in Galilee and Judea,—while Beecher addresses more the idea of virtue or manliness, as if seeking to press home dishonesty, cowardice, and meanness as the cardinal sins.

In respect to *form*, both make use of all the elements of power enumerated. Both delight to present truth in the *concrete*. Both hold practically to the theory that *the world is typical*, and so both abound in apt illustration. Beecher, born a poet, yet affectionately acknowledges, in his "Star Papers," his indebtedness to Ruskin for the "blessings of sight." "We are more indebted to him for the blessings of sight than to all

other men. We were, in respect to nature, of the number of those who, having eyes, saw not, and ears, heard not. He taught us what to see and how to see." Spurgeon, in one of his early sermons, gives substantial expression of his adherence to the same theory, though coming by it in a different way. The world in all its breadth is thus tributary to both, and is made to speak most eloquently for God through them. Beecher uses it the more poetically, Spurgeon the more practically. Both present *specific truth*, and are, therefore, always fresh and novel. Of the two, Beecher is rather the man of genius and artistic excellence, Spurgeon the model gospel preacher, and the man of larger Christian influence with the masses. While admitting that no man is to be servilely copied, we yet hold it duty to lay hold of and turn to service every element of power in every man. It is granted and affirmed that there are objectionable elements and eccentricities in their style, especially in Mr. Beecher's, which are to be avoided, at least by other men, and through mad imitation of which this country and Great Britain have been visited with an infliction of a set of clergymen of the "Rev. Shallow Splurge" type. But though these peculiarities lessen their influence, they abate not one whit from the value of the princely gifts bestowed upon them by the Master. We are constrained to think that if Mr. Beecher preached the central doctrine of the cross with the fulness and the "blood earnestness" of Spurgeon, he would be everyway the mightiest man of the modern popular pulpit. These powers of the two men, so far as available, all the pulpit should seek to make of service. Preaching, so conformed to what is right in high example, as well as to the demands of correct theory, meeting the actual needs of men in all the relations of life, will be a master power in the world. It will have the grandest of beauty, and yet not be a gospel of æsthetics; it will possess perpetual novelty, and yet not be a gospel of "clap-trap;" it will always be sublimely practical, but never a gospel of petty scolding. Such preaching will meet the demands of the three tendencies noted at the beginning of this discussion as characterizing the times in which we live.

3dly. It is clear that, in accordance with our general answer

to the question proposed at the outset, *the spirit of the pulpit* must be conformed to right theory, so as to meet the wants of the times. *Men must preach the gospel with a living sense of their grand mission to save souls.* For want of space, we can barely indicate what needs to be brought out in this connection. Dr. Wayland, in his work on the "Christian Ministry," has clearly shown that ministry to be, not a profession, and not on a level with the professions, but most widely separated from them in being a *calling.* A *call* to this great and solemn work, direct from the living God, is the first thing requisite—a call which shall make a man cry out, under a sense of his responsibility, (with Paul,) "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." Then the vocation of the minister demands intense sympathy with Christ in the work of saving souls. This can only come through the knowledge of God's word in all the forms of theology, from didactic, polemic, historical, exegetical, all the way in to the intimacy of acquaintance with that word which belongs to practical theology, and through the rich indwelling of the Spirit of Christ. Moreover, there must be that complete knowledge of men, and sympathy with them, which can come only from intimate and constant contact with them, both as a man and a pastor. Add to all, large expectation of results. "Preach the word, and *leave* the results to God," so we are wont to say. We hold this form of statement, as it is sometimes meant, to be neither scriptural nor true. Preach the word, and *expect* results from God, is truth and Scripture. It recognizes *faith* as a substantial element of power. Men must feel that their work is one of life and death, and, at the same time, a work in which God and Christ are more interested than they can be—and then, with correct theory working in the right way, and in the proper spirit, they may expect that perishing men will assuredly be reached, and by God's grace, saved. Would that the whole truth concerning the mission of the ministry might be written on the heart of every messenger of God with a pen of fire, and in perpetually burning words, for without it thus fixed in the soul, there can be no such thing as success in the highest and truest sense. The little work of Bonar, entitled, "Words to the Winners of Souls," presents the idea with great force. True it is that a

certain class of men cry out against what they are pleased to denominate its "*legal spirit*," and to declaim against it as setting up an unscriptural standard by which to try the work of the ministry, but we believe that earnest and sincere men cannot but plead guilty to every charge it brings against us of this day.

We need a new life in the ministry. We quote from Bonar. "*The infusion of new life into the ministry* ought to be the object of more direct and special effort, as well as of more united and fervent prayer. To the students, the preachers, the ministers of the Christian church, the prayers of the Christians ought more largely to be directed. It is a *living* ministry that our country needs, and without such a ministry it cannot long expect to escape the judgments of God. We need men that will spend and be spent—that will labour and pray—that will watch and weep for souls." And without such a ministry, without such men, there is no salvation for us!

The glance which a living church to-day casts down from the eminence to which the ages have brought her, cannot but be an anxious one. Looking out upon the world, and noting the signs of the times, we cannot resist the conviction that we are at the dawning of an eventful period in her history. Perhaps this should be characterized as the age of Christian action. At least it must be admitted an age which specially calls for such action. The growth of the modern missionary movement has been confessedly one of the marvels of the world. That God, for the coming of whose kingdom all things are working together, has prepared the way for it by the progress of science and art, which has already been noted. There has always been the same perishing world, but it has heretofore been a far-off world. The later centuries have been bringing it nearer and into oneness with us, until at last, by that mysterious electric power, which with equal ease spans the continents and oceans, God is gathering the nations into one mighty audience chamber of the gospel, to the remotest aisles of which every voice in the church may reach, and the touch of every hand vibrate. The rapidity of the flight of the angel of the Apocalypse, bearing the everlasting gospel, seems about

to be realized. And in the movements of God's kingdom this nation has, by its geographical position, its political character, its commercial connection, and the orderings of Providence, been made a centre. Upon us the old world in all its parts has poured out its superabundant population. Besides the myriads brought near by the outward bonds and means of intercommunication, here are the millions from darkened Africa, from papal and infidel Europe, and from far-off heathen Asia, in our midst, furnishing, so to speak, the links in the chain of sympathy which is to bind to us the destinies of the world. The problem of the world's conversion has thus been forced upon us as upon no other people. Here is the learning requisite to translate the Bible into every tongue within the lifetime of a single generation. Here is the steam-press with which to print a copy of it for every son and daughter of Adam within the same period. Here are the men from whom messengers might in the same time be sent to every hamlet on the face of the globe. Here are the great thoroughfares by which the missionaries and Bibles might be sent. And here is the gold with which to accomplish all this work in so brief space. Here are the glorious *possibilities*,—what shall the *actual* be? A complete Christianity, working with full power in this land and out from it, would, we doubt not, in the course of the next half century, compass the globe with its saving and elevating influences. Shall all this be done? It will depend, in great measure, under God, upon what *the ministry* of the present and coming generations shall be, and upon what the character of *the preaching* for the next quarter century shall be.

Art. II.—*The Trinity in Redemption.*

The Supreme Being is not revealed to us in the Bible as *One* Person: the Deity is tri-personal, not uni-personal. God is not the Father alone; nor the Son alone; nor the Spirit alone: not a single Person, nor two of the Persons, but the three Persons are the "one true eternal God"* of Creation and Redemption: each of these severally considered possesses, absolutely, perfectly, and eternally, the essence, the nature of Divinity in equal measure and glory; and each is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

While thus in the proper attributes and perfections of the Divine nature the Three Persons are One, all communicating in the same numerical and infinite essence, each of the Three has distinguishing and peculiar personal characteristics. Their Personality, unlike their Deity, is not the same. That of each is perfect in its kind, but the Three are *personally* diverse from each other. The orthodox creeds are unanimous in their statements and expositions on this subject. It is the property of the Father, who Himself is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding, to beget the Son: Paternity is the personal sign and distinction of the First Person. It is the property of the Son, who Himself is neither made nor proceeding, to be eternally begotten of the Father: Filiation is the personal mark and characteristic of the Second Person of the Godhead. It is the property of the Holy Spirit, who Himself is neither made nor begotten, to proceed from the Father and the Son from all eternity: Procession is the distinctive personal mark of the Third Person in the adorable Trinity. And as different as Paternity, Filiation, and Procession are from each other, just so different are the Persons of the Godhead, as Persons each from the others. So that the making of One Person out of the Three (which is Sabellianism) is impossible: and, as these Three all partake of

* Larger Catechism, Quest. 9.

and communicate in one essence, one indivisible eternal nature, so it is impossible that there should be three Gods in the three Persons. The Scriptures exclude alike a Modal Trinity and Tritheism.

On this revelation of a Tri-personal Jehovah is founded the whole revealed scheme of the Divine administration throughout the universe: and in nothing is it more luminous and more glorious than in the economy of our salvation.

One other preliminary: Along with the statement that God is *tri-personal*, not one Person, let it be observed concerning the Divine Agency, that though all the Divine Persons concur in it, so that each Divine act is the act of the whole Godhead, yet, that, generally, when it is said in the Bible that God or Jehovah did or purposed to do anything, it is to be understood that One of the Persons of the Trinity is intended; and usually the immediate context will enable us to decide which of the Persons is meant. For example, we read, Gen. i. 26, "God said let us make man in our image," where evidently the First Person is the speaker. "God* so loved the world that He," *i. e.*, the Father, "gave his only begotten Son," &c. "The Word was with God,"† *i. e.*, with God the Father. "God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God," *i. e.*, the Father, "sent his only begotten Son,"‡ &c. "Feed the church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood,"§ and "God was manifest in the flesh,"‖ when the Second Person is intended. "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God,"¶ when the Third Person is referred to.

Now the agency and relations, the love and manifestation of these several Divine persons in our redemption, are, according to the Scriptures, determined and characterized by their *personal* peculiarities.** The Father being of none, neither be-

* John iii. 16. † John i. 1. ‡ 1 John iv. 8, 9.
§ Acts xx. 28. ‖ 1 Tim. iii. 16. ¶ Acts v. 4.

** And our *duties* toward the Great Supreme are similarly determined and characterized. Bishop Waterland, vol. iii. p. 416, admirably states this: "If God be *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, the duties owing to God will be duties under that triune distinction; which must be paid accordingly; and whoever leaves out any of the three out of his idea of God, comes so far short of honouring God *perfectly*, and of serving Him in proportion to the manifestations made of Him. Supposing our doctrine true, there will be duties proper

gotten nor proceeding, is properly called the *Fons Trinitatis*, the Eternal Fountain of the Triune Godhead: He is the Father of the Son, from both of whom is the Eternal Spirit. He is in like manner the *Fons Redemptionis*. His personal love for man is the basis and inspiration of the whole work. *He* selects from among the generations of men those who are finally saved, and gives them in an eternal covenant to His only begotten Son, as His bride and everlasting inheritance. He commissions His Son, and sends him to our world to take our nature into a vital and everlasting union with His own, and then to expiate our guilt in a bloody sacrifice. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life." He ordains for that Son on our account the whole course of His life; the time and the manner of His advent, the successive stages and character of His career, all His sufferings, and all His work. Christ did nothing except as taught and directed by His Father. He tells us this with the utmost explicitness—"I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me."* "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish his work."† "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do, for whatsoever things He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise."‡ And then all His *teachings* were not His, but His Father's. The words which He spake were given to Him of His Father. "I have not *spoken* of myself; but the Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. * * Whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."§ "I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me."‖ Thus all the words, and deeds, and sufferings, all the life and death of Christ, express not simply nor primarily His love to us, but declare with an emphasis, if possible, even more distinct, the primal, sovereign, infinite love of God

to be paid to the Father as Father, and to the Son as Son, and to the Holy Ghost as the Eternal Spirit of both, duties correspondent to their distinct offices and personalities, beside the duties common to all three considered as one God."

* John vi. 38. † John iv. 34. ‡ John v. 19.
§ John xii. 49, 50. ‖ John xvii. 8.

the Father for us. "In this was manifested the love of God (the Father) toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him."*

A second illustration of the loving agency of God the Father given in the Bible is the mission by Him of the Third Person of the Trinity. It is unnecessary here to enlarge upon this. The Scriptures greatly magnify it, and we shall refer to it again in another part of this article.

Thus as God the Father is the First Person of the Godhead, so is He first in the order of agency in the work of redemption. God's love is not only paternal, it is primal or fontal in the First of the Divine Persons. Hence the language of Philip† was but the natural expression of an enlightened conscience eager for certainty and peace. "Show us the Father;" let us know and understand His love towards us, "and it sufficeth us." If He is reconciled,—if He justifies, all is well. In the gift of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, the whole mind of the Father is unveiled, the fountains of the great deep of His love are broken up. The dark problem concerning the feelings of eternal justice and majesty is solved; all uncertainty is removed. God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them:‡ and an appeal is hereby made to our reason and humanity that would seem to be irresistible, did not fact affirm the contrary.

Such is the part of God the Father in our salvation. Yet this infinite affection, the existence of this paternal relationship, and this its wondrous outworking, are powerless on man. We read the divinely attested record of His love; we hear God Himself proclaiming it. We know that God is love, love to us; He has given infinite proofs of it, but such is the condition of our souls that the amazing truth is generally like a dream. God the Father loves us—loves us with all His heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and our return is enmity. "Hear, O heavens; and give ear, O earth; for the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me."§

What now is the peculiar agency of God the Son in our redemption? The second person of the Godhead, while in His

* 1 John iv. 9. † John xiv. 8. ‡ 2 Cor. v. 19. § Isaiah i. 2.

personality as the Son, He is subordinate to His eternal Father, yet being Himself absolutely Divine, equal with the Father in power and glory, has in and of Himself a peculiar relation to us, and an agency in our salvation correspondently peculiar. His agency, indeed, from its immediateness and necessary prominence, may, through inadvertence, exclude from view, or at least disparage that of the eternal Father: it is at least more difficult for us to appreciate the sacrifice of God the Father in giving up His only Son, than that of God the Son in the infinite humiliation of His incarnation and life on earth; in His assumption of the guilt of human sin; in His suffering the wrath of eternal justice in the garden and on the cross. Yet we suppose that the language—"He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all,"* interpreted by the Abrahamic type, the sacrifice of Isaac; the words, "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts;"† "*the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity* of us all," * * "*stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted,*"‡ together with the actual penal forsaking of the brightness of His glory, the express image of His Person; we suppose all this grounded in the ineffable instincts (if we may venture the expression,) of paternity in the Father towards His only Son, whose filial affection was reciprocal and responsive; all this indicates a self-sacrificing love for us on the part of the Father, which has no more than its parallel in the love of the Eternal Son.

This love of the Second Person of the Godhead, however, is His own individual love. It is something to be regarded and reciprocated by us as the additional peculiar affection of the Godhead, in the person of Christ, for us lost sinners. In its actings or modes of manifestation, it stands alone in an infinite peculiarity. That love of Christ, whose breadth, and length, and depth, and heighth pass knowledge, is Christ's own, not another's. The Father's love is summed up in the gift of Christ and mission of the Spirit. The Son's love is summed up in the gift of Himself for us, and conjointly with the Father in the mission of the Spirit. And there is this difference between them to be noted; the Father's love appeals to us

* Rom. viii. 32. † Zech. xiii. 7. ‡ Isaiah liii. 4, 6.

through *declarations* of itself; it is a testimony, addressed to us as rational, thinking beings. The Bible, as we have seen, expressly teaches us that the Father is the beginning and springhead of our redemption, and we are called upon to *know* and *believe* the love of God the Father to us. The love of the Son, on the other hand, is an appeal, not simply to our intelligence, and so to our heart, but this order is reversed. That love speaks to us through the sensibilities, almost through the senses. The humiliation of the Son of God; His lowly birth and training; His life of goodness; His shame and agony, His sorrow in the garden, and His accursed death; His burial, resurrection, and ascension, these are manifestations of love, addressed directly to the feelings of men, originally to the actual senses of many, with whom He dwelt for more than thirty years in Palestine. These persons saw, and heard, and handled, and walked with Him who was Immanuel, God with us; a man as truly as we are men, God manifest in the flesh. Divine love was rendered palpable in the humanity, the sad but holy life, the painful sufferings, the death of Him who was the Prince of Life, the Second Person of the adorable Godhead. Thus as to the distinct individuality of Christ's agency in redemption; it is as different from that of the Father as He himself is distinct and different from the Father, as much so as Filiation is distinct from Paternity.

But again, such is the depravity of the human heart that the Lord Jesus Christ is despised and rejected of men. The incarnate Word comes to His next of kin, and they receive Him not. All His love, so self-sacrificing, so pure, so palpable, fails to win and draw men unto Him. All day long He stretches out His hand unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

Thus two of the sacred Persons of the adorable Godhead are revealed to us, having and exercising a several and infinite love for us, and separately and unitedly failing to move and conquer the apostate sons of men.

There remains one other Person in the Godhead, who being distinct in His personal properties from both the others, has a love for us which is distinct and peculiar to Himself, denomi-

nated by Paul, "the love of the Spirit."* The agency and relations of the Holy Spirit in the plan of redemption are radically different from those of either the Father or the Son. If the love of the Spirit displayed itself only after the manner of either or both of the other persons, the result would unquestionably be the same as in their cases. Infinite love in the Father shown in the sacrifice of His only Son for us; infinite love in the Son, shown in the voluntary offering of Himself for us, are powerless. If we are to be saved, another mode must be tried. Declarations and palpable exhibitions of Divine love are ineffectual. Divine appeals to the intellect and the heart are vain. There is no point of contact, no ground of fellowship between man and God in this way. Man's understanding is darkened; his heart is as adamant. In this connection how instructive is the language of our Lord in John xvi. 7, 8:—"I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send Him to you; and when He is come, He will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." The return of Christ to the Father is essential to the advent of the Spirit, and that in which both the former failed, if we may so speak, will be accomplished by Him; when *He* is come, *He* will convince the world of sin, &c.

On the subject of the agency and operations of the Third Person of the Godhead we shall but suggest the merest outline; and this only in part.

The Holy Spirit is to be regarded, First, As a new conjoint manifestation and proof of the persistent love of the Father and the Son to us. "Whom the Father will send." "Whom I will send." "Whom the Father will send in my name." "Whom I will send from the Father." And as the Holy Spirit is free and perfect in His own Personality, and comes to us of his own accord, comes in fullest sympathy with the Father and the Son, in the exercise of His own special and peculiar love, the Eternal Spirit condescending to the watch

* Rom. xv. 30.

and care and conduct of worthless and vile worms of the dust,* we have therefore in His Presence and Agency a demonstrative exhibition of the combined love of the Sacred Trinity, three oceans of Divine clemency and grace coalescing. And as the specific office-work of the Holy Spirit is to reveal the infinite love of God the Father, the infinite grace of God the Son, and the infinite condescension and communion of God the Spirit, so it comes to pass that sin against the Holy Ghost is aggravated beyond sin against the Father in his peculiar love, or against the Son in His, yea above all sin. In a peculiar and preëminent sense the whole Godhead is sinned against when this Divine Agent and Representative is dishonoured and offended. And so too, the whole Godhead is, in the same sense, loved in the reception of the Holy Spirit. Welcoming and cherishing the Holy Spirit is embracing and loving the Father, Son, and Spirit. We have access to the Father only by the Son; we love and believe the Son only by the Spirit, and if the Spirit is grieved and banished, then the soul is shut out from the entire ever-blessed Trinity, and God and man are sundered from each other for ever.

In the next place, the Holy Spirit must be regarded in the nature or method of His Agency. This, as we have remarked, is entirely different from those of the other two Persons of the Godhead. The Holy Spirit's effective working, does not consist in appealing to our rational or intelligent nature: in addressing our hopes or fears, our love of happiness or dread of pain, our sense of justice or gratitude, our sympathies and better impulses. This method had been abundantly tried; every faculty and susceptibility of our being had been appealed to. A repetition of it would but result in a repetition of failure, for it is not in the power of the Third Person of the Godhead to surpass in love for man the Father or the Son.

What then is the special character of the agency of the Spirit? How does He distinctively and effectively exercise His

* John Howe, vol. v. p. 198, says, "Would any of us deign to be obliged to have from day to day the guiding and conducting of all the motions of a worm? And we need not be told how much less considerable we are in refer- to the great God and the blessed Spirit, than any, the most despicable worm, is to us."

love and grace to us? We answer, *by an immediate direct operation upon the mind or soul of man.* His is a work not of mere persuasion, but of direct supernatural power. It is not distinctively the force of truth, it is rather that which makes truth forcible. It is not the power of argument. It is not the influence of motive, the persuading, wooing, winning processes of oratorical discourse; far otherwise. Such is the condition of the human mind, such the lapsed and disordered state of our faculties, that all exhibitions of Divine truth and goodness, all mere argument and entreaty, are of no avail whatsoever, unless it be to sear and deaden the soul against the mighty verities, the tremendous realities of God's revelation. An eloquent speaker once said of constitutional freedom in Naples and Venice, that "its crushed and mangled form could be seen to twitch and quiver under the dark pall of arbitrary power;" but spiritual freedom, the freedom of the soul in God and goodness, is not only crushed and mangled, it is dead. No deep heart pulsations, no convulsive throbs move the folds or shake the ruffles of the shroud in which her sacred form is wrapped. The celestial fire is extinct; the Divine breath is departed. The eye is closed to the radiant throne of God the Father's eternal love; to Calvary's bleeding cross of mercy, and all the unveiled realities of the spiritual and eternal worlds. The ear is deaf to the voices that come from the excellent glory. The solemn verities of the fall and condemnation of man, of death, resurrection, and the judgment, are like the wind upon the face of the dead. For, in truth, we are *dead;* absolutely dead in trespasses and sins. The distinctive agency of the Holy Spirit therefore is more than an objective presentation to the intellect or senses or imagination of men. It is the direct energetic action of His Power upon the mind. Whatever external, visible, and tangible means He may use, whether in providential events or in the revealed word are mere instruments or channels through which He approaches the citadel of spiritual death; and gaining access to the very centre of our rational and moral natures He imparts a movement to it by an immediate direct influence. Thus in the language of Inspiration, man may become a partaker of the Holy Ghost. The eyes of his understanding are opened, his heart is touched and roused, and the things of the

Spirit, the things of God, of Christ, of eternity become realities to him. In brief, the work of the Holy Spirit is that of a mysterious contact of Deity with humanity, of the Creator of the mind with its secret essence, of the Infinite Spirit with the finite and fallen spirit of man.

But the direct agency of the Spirit is not always effectual. In some of His operations He is irresistible. He works and none can let Him; none can stay His hand, or say unto Him what doest thou? When God made Adam out of the dust of the ground, he was unable to resist the Omnipotent energy that gave him being. And when God endowed him with righteousness and true holiness, Adam could not prevent his having such a moral and spiritual constitution. He found himself in his deepest consciousness a holy and upright man, fashioned in the image of God by the power of the Holy Spirit. So too, the renovation of the soul of man in his fallen state, regeneration is the result of simple Omnipotence exercised by the Holy Spirit. This is a new creation, a resurrection from death in sin, the impartation of spiritual life, and is produced by an exercise of power on the part of the Holy Spirit, like that exceeding greatness of the Divine power which raised Christ from the dead and set Him at God's right hand in the heavenly places. In this matter a man is in the hands of the Holy Spirit as clay is in the hands of the potter. He does according to His own pleasure, absolutely, irresistibly. In the language of our *Confession of Faith*, (Chap. x. sec. 2), "This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it."

But there are other operations of the Spirit to which resistance, successful resistance, may be made by the subjects of them. It is of His agency in these we would speak in closing this essay.

Concerning this ineffectual work of the Spirit, we remark,

(1.) That it is no less than regeneration itself—a secret, silent influence, beyond the reach of the senses or of mental perception, which affects us before we are aware of it, and is

discoverable only by its immediate or subsequent fruits. We are unconscious of its approaches. It is like the wind that bloweth where it listeth. It is the sacred breath breathing upon the slain, that they may live. It is the still small voice of God that comes as a whisper upon the ear of the soul. It is a Divine invisible hand touching the springs of our mental activity. Its working is in such perfect unison with our nature, in such living harmony with all our faculties, that we do not at first suspect the presence of the Divine agency. God is with us, and we know it not. The thoughts that are awakened, the emotions that are stirred, the desires that are kindled, seem so thoroughly our own, so proper to us, so natural, that we do not at first think of attributing them to any other source than our own mental activity. As the subtle, marvellous force of gravitation, without our thought, or will, or feeling, and often without our knowledge, pervades and upholds and quickens us, so the Divine Spirit enters and supports and works in us for our salvation. Thus by His spiritual influence penetrating the recesses of our minds, coming into contact with the hidden fibres and nerves of our hearts, He anticipates our depravity. Before our evil hearts can act they are acted upon, and thus grace gets an advantage both of nature and of Satan. We find these better views and feelings already in place and asserting their power. They are the insignia of the Divine presence; our treatment of them is a direct dealing with the Holy Spirit. We cannot stand aloof from Him as we do from the Father and the Son, and refuse His love, as something objective proffered to us, but we must receive or resist the Eternal Spirit Himself after He has mysteriously entered within us. We must eject or welcome the sacred visitant after He has commenced working directly upon and within us.

(2.) We remark, however, in the next place, that while this direct influence of the Holy Spirit is so independent of our thought and will, and is so subtle and secret in its working, it is ordinarily exerted in connection with Bible truth. The revealed word is commonly its instrument, its measure, and its test. Whatever may be the effect on any person of the Divine working, that effect, at least, is to be judged of by the Bible. Thus it is that the Holy Spirit testifies to the reality, nature,

and extent of His operations. Hence His Divine power awakens, alarms, enlightens, convinces, changes, renews, comforts and sanctifies through the word. When a person in the reading, or the hearing, or the recollection of the words of Scripture *feels* their power, when their record of guilt and danger, of Christ and of retribution ceases to be a mere record, is no longer a speculation or an opinion, but a real verity, a living personal concern, piercing, startling, condemning, then the Almighty Spirit of God is in the soul in loving mercy, performing His peculiar function as the Third Person of the Sacred Trinity. And it is very interesting to note, that, not the Holy Spirit Himself, but rather the Lord Jesus Christ, is first appreciated and loved by the sinner in the successful issue of these Divine operations. The Spirit glorifies Christ; He takes of the things of Christ, and shows them unto us; He opens the eyes of the understanding to perceive the Lord Christ as a Saviour, revealing him to the soul in his Person, in his work, in all his offices, as the chief of ten thousand, the one altogether lovely. The result, when there is a happy result, of all the arresting, convincing, alarming influence of the Holy Spirit, is to lead the subject of this influence to believe and love that once and long despised and rejected Redeemer.

(3.) Let it be observed, finally, that this work of the Holy Spirit is various and sovereign. It is not always the same either in kind or in degree, and is often different in the same person. He dispenses his gifts and graces according to the counsel of his own will. His love is infinite, but it is the love of an infinitely wise Person, dealing with free and rational, though depraved moral agents. Hence there is generally a process or gradation in His influences, a small silent beginning, with subsequent additions. As in the vision of the prophet, first there was shaking among the scattered dry bones, then a coming together of the bones, bone to his bone; next sinews came upon them, and flesh was added to these, and then skin covered them; but there was as yet no *life* in them. Presently, at the cry of the prophet, "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live," the breath came upon them, and they lived and stood upon their feet. So, under the influences of the Spirit, thoughtfulness

will precede alarm, and alarm conviction, and conviction confession, and confession faith, and faith will be followed by hope, and peace, and joy, and holiness. The understanding may be first enlightened, or the sensibilities may be moved, or the conscience may be quickened. Sometimes the result is all that can be wished; the sinner is renewed and forever united to Christ. In other instances the case of Saul is repeated—"The Spirit of the Lord came upon him and gave him another heart," but not the new heart; he was changed, but he was not regenerated. And sometimes, as the Saviour teaches in the parable of the sower, the influence is temporary and superficial. Often, very often, do men receive the grace of God in vain. The Spirit is a righteous Sovereign, and men can vex his benignant heart and limit his influence so that He may stop short in His work of mercy; and thus this gracious power, moving in the depths of the soul, secretly guiding, inspiring, urging the sinner to renounce his sin and flee to Christ, is banished and withdraws. There are six forms of expression made use of in the Bible to set forth the activity of the human soul against the presence, power, and grace of the Divine Spirit; these are "resist," "limit," "grieve," "provoke," "vex," "quench." And the responsibility of men under these influences of the Holy Spirit is to the last degree solemn. For these sacred influences all look and tend to actual regeneration. They are the preparations of the Holy Ghost in the sinner with a view to that mighty change.* They look to the breaking down of

* John Owen (vol. iii., p. 329, Goold's edition,) says, "There are ordinarily certain previous and preparatory works or workings in and upon the souls of men that are antecedent and dispositive unto regeneration." John Howe (vol. i. p. 413, London ed. 1822—see also p. 430,) says, "We must know there are vincible operations of that Spirit, leading on to those that are victorious, being complied with; otherwise to the most terrible vengeance." Vol. v. p. 23:—"There are many previous workings in order to regeneration, wherein the Spirit of God is frequently resisted; that is the workings and operations of common grace which lead and tend to this special work of grace." The *Larger Catechism*, in answer to Q. 68, Are the elect only effectually called? says:—"All the elect, and they only, are effectually called; although others may be, and often are, outwardly called by the ministry of the word, and have some common operations of the Spirit; *who for their wilful neglect and contempt of the grace offered to them*, being justly left in their unbelief, do never truly come to Jesus Christ." (See also "*Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine*," vol. ii. p. 68.)

the barriers which so long had shut out all the love of God the Father, and all the grace and goodness of God the Son. This, according to the Bible and the experience of Christians is almost universally the method pursued by the Spirit of God. He convinces of sin, of righteousness, and of a judgment to come, before He performs that work by which the soul is savingly renewed and comforted and sanctified.

And there being no fourth person in the Godhead, and the love of the Father and the love of the Son having been rejected, the Holy Spirit is man's last, man's only hope.* The Father and the Son are accessible only by the Spirit. If the work of this Divine Person is thwarted, if His influences are overborne and quenched, if He is grieved away and finally departs, then all is over with the sinner. He is joined to his idols, God the Spirit departs from him, eternal "woe" is his portion.

Thus we see that it is not merely by the manifestation of such love as that of God the Father in the sacrificial gift of his only begotten Son, nor by that of the matchless kindness of God the Son, in His incarnation and death, that our actual salvation is effected, but by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; through whom we are brought into fellowship with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ, and receive the fulness of their separate and combined love in the great mystery of redemption. The love of God the Father and the grace of Christ are rendered effectual only by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit.

* Owen, vol. iii. p. 28, says:—"As God hath not another Son to offer, another sacrifice for sin, so that he by whom His sacrifice is despised can have none remaining for him; no more hath He *another Spirit* to make that sacrifice effectual unto us, if the Holy Spirit in His work be despised and rejected."

Art. III.—*The Monophysite Churches of the East.* By Philip Schaff, D. D., New York.

The Monophysites, like their antagonists the Nestorians, have maintained themselves in the East as separate sects under their own bishops and patriarchs, even to the present day; thus proving the tenacity of those Christological errors, which acknowledge the full Godhead and manhood of Christ, while those errors of the ancient church, which deny the Godhead or the manhood, (Ebionism, Gnosticism, Manichæism, Arianism, &c.,) as sects, have long since vanished. These Christological schismatics stand, as if enchanted, upon the same position which they assumed in the fifth century. The Nestorians reject the third œcumenical councils, the Monophysites the fourth; the former hold the distinction of natures, even to abstract separation; the latter, the fusion of the two natures in one, with a stubbornness which has defied centuries, and forbids their return to the bosom of the orthodox Greek church. They are properly the ancient *national* churches of Egypt, Syria, and Armenia, in distinction from the orthodox Greek church, and the *united* or Roman church of the East.

The Monophysites are scattered upon the mountains, and in the valleys and deserts of Syria, Armenia, Assyria, Egypt, and Abyssinia, and, like the orthodox Greeks of those countries, live mostly under Mohammedan, partly under Russian rule. They supported the Arabs and Turks in weakening, and at last conquering the Byzantine Empire, and thus furthered the ultimate victory of Islam. In return, they were variously favoured by the conquerors, and upheld in their separation from the Greek church. They have long since fallen into stagnation, ignorance, and superstition, and are to Christendom as a praying corpse to a living man. They are isolated fragments of the ancient church history, and curious petrifactions from the Christological battle-fields of the fifth and sixth centuries, coming to view amidst Mohammedan scenes. But Providence has preserved them, like the Jews, and doubtless not without design, through storms of war and persecution, unchanged

until the present time. Their very hatred against the orthodox Greek church makes them more accessible both to Protestant and Roman missions, and to the influences of Western Christianity and Western civilization.

On the other hand, they are a door for Protestantism to the Arabs and the Turks; to the former through the Jacobites, to the latter through the Armenians. There is the more reason for such a hope in the fact that the Mohammedans despise the oriental churches, and must be won, if at all, by a purer type of Christianity. In this respect the American missions among the Armenians in the Turkish Empire are, like those among the Nestorians in Persia, of great prospective importance as outposts of a religion which is destined sooner or later to regenerate the East.

With the exception of the Chalcedonian Christology, which they reject as Nestorian heresy, most of the doctrines, institutions, and rites of the Monophysite sects are common to them with the orthodox Greek church. They reject, or at least do not recognize the *filioque;* they hold to the mass, or the Eucharistic sacrifice, with a kind of transubstantiation; leavened bread in the Lord's Supper; baptismal regeneration by trine immersion; seven sacraments, (yet not explicitly, since they either have no definite term for sacrament, or no settled conception of it); the patriarchal polity; monasticism, pilgrimages, and fasting; the requisition of a single marriage for priests and deacons, (bishops are not allowed to marry); the prohibition of the eating of blood, or of things strangled.

On the other hand, they know nothing of purgatory and indulgences, and have a simpler worship than the Greeks and Romans. According to their doctrine, all men after death go into Hades, a place alike without sorrow or joy; after the general judgment they enter into heaven, or are cast into hell; and meanwhile the intercessions and pious works of the living have an influence on the final destiny of the departed. Like the orthodox Greeks, they honour pictures and relics of the saints, but not in the same degree. Scripture and tradition are with them coördinate sources of revelation and rules of faith. The reading of the Bible is not forbidden, but is limited by the ignorance of the people themselves. They use in wor-

ship the ancient vernacular tongues, which, however, are now dead languages to them.

There are four branches of the Monophysites: the Syrian JACOBITES; the COPTS, including the ABYSSINIANS; the ARMENIANS; and the less ancient MARONITES.

I. The JACOBITES in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia. Their name comes down from their œcumenical* metropolitan, JACOB, surnamed BARADAI, or ZANZALUS.† This remarkable man, in the middle of the sixth century, devoted himself for seven and thirty years (541—578), with unwearied zeal to the interests of the persecuted Monophysites. "Lightfooted as Azahel"‡ and in the garb of a beggar, he journeyed hither and thither amid the greatest dangers and privations; revived the patriarchate of Antioch; ordained bishops, priests, and deacons; organized churches; healed divisions, and thus saved the Monophysite body from impending extinction.

The patriarch bears the title of Patriarch of Antioch, because the succession is traced back to Severus of Antioch; but he commonly resides in Diarbekir, or other towns or monasteries. Since the fourteenth century the patriarch has always borne the name Ignatius, after the famous martyr and bishop of Antioch.

The Jacobite monks are noted for gross superstition and rigorous asceticism. A part of the Jacobites have united with the church of Rome. Lately some Protestant missionaries from America have also found entrance among them.

II. The COPTS§ in Egypt are in nationality the genuine descendants of the ancient Egyptians, though with an admixture of Greek and Arab blood. Soon after the council of Chalcedon, they chose Timotheus Ælurus in opposition to the

* *Œcumenical, i. e.*, not restricted to any particular province.

† From his beggarly clothing. Baradai signifies in Arabic and Syriac, horse-blanket of coarse cloth, and τζάνζαλον, is *vile aliquid et tritum.* (See Rödiger in Herzog's Encycl. vi. 401.)

‡ 2 Sam. ii. 18.

§ From Αἴγυπτος, Guptos, and not, as some suppose, from the town Koptos, nor from an abbreviation of *Jacobite.* They are the most ancient, but Christian Egyptians, in distinction from the Pharaonic (Chem), those of the Old Testament (Mizrim), the Macedonian or Greek (Αἰγ.) and the modern Arab Egyptians (Mizr.)

patriarch Proterius. After varying fortunes, they have, since 536, had their own patriarchs of Alexandria, who, like most of the Egyptian dignitaries, commonly resides at Cairo. He accounts himself the true successor of the evangelist Mark, St. Athanasius, and Cyril. He is always chosen from among the monks, and, in rigid adherence to the traditionary *nolo episcopari*, he is elected against his will; he is obliged to lead a strict ascetic life, and at night is waked every quarter of an hour for a short prayer. He alone has the power to ordain, and he performs this function not by imposition of hands, but by breathing on and anointing the candidate. His jurisdiction extends over the churches of Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia, or Ethiopia. He chooses and anoints the Abuna (*i. e.*, our Father), or patriarch for Abyssinia. Under him are twelve bishops, some with real jurisdiction, some titular; and under these again the other clergy, down to readers and exorcists. There are still extant two incomplete Coptic versions of the Scriptures, the Upper Egyptian or Thebaic, called also after the Arabic name of the province, the Sahidic, *i. e.*, Highland version; and the Lower Egyptian or Memphitic.*

The Copts were much more numerous than the Catholics, whom they scoffingly nicknamed *Melchites*,† or "Cæsar-Christians." They lived with them on terms of deadly enmity, and facilitated the conquest of Egypt by the Saracens (641). But they were afterwards cruelly persecuted by these very Saracens,‡ and dwindled from some two millions of souls to a hundred and fifty or two hundred thousand, of whom about ten thousand, or according to others, from thirty to sixty thousand live in Cairo, and the rest mostly in Upper Egypt. They now, in common with all other religious sects, enjoy toleration. They and the Abyssinians are distinguished from the other Monophysites by the Jewish and Mohammedan practice of circumcision, which is performed by lay persons (on both sexes) and in Egypt is grounded upon sanitary considerations. They

* Of this latter H. Tattam and P. Bötticher (1852) have lately published considerable fragments.

† From the Hebrew *melech*, king.

‡ So that even their Arabic historian Mackrizi was moved to compassion for them.

still observe the Jewish law of meats. They are sunk in poverty, ignorance, and semi-barbarism. Even the clergy, who indeed are taken from the lowest class of the people, are a beggarly set, and understand nothing but how to read mass, and perform the various ceremonies. They do not even know the Coptic or old Egyptian, their own ancient ecclesiastical language. They live by farming and their official fees. The literary treasures of their convents, in the Coptic, Syriac, and Arabic languages, have been of late secured for the most part to the British Museum, by Tattam and other travellers.

Missions have lately been undertaken among them, especially by the Church Missionary Society of England (commencing in 1825), and the United Presbyterians of America.*

The *Abyssinian* church is a daughter of the Coptic, and was founded in the fourth century by two missionaries from Alexandria, Thumentius and Aldezius. It is a strange mixture of barbarism, ignorance, superstition, and Christianity. Its Ethiopic Bible, which dates perhaps from the first missionaries, includes in the Old Testament the apocryphal book of Enoch. The Chronicles of Axuma (the former capital of the country), dating from the fourth century, receive almost the same honour as the Bible. The council of Chalcedon is accounted an assembly of fools and heretics. The Abyssinian church has retained even more Jewish elements than the Coptic. It observes the Jewish Sabbath together with the Christian Sunday; it forbids the use of the flesh of swine and other unclean beasts; it celebrates a yearly feast of general lustration or rebaptizing of the whole nation; it retains the model of a sacred ark, called the ark of Zion, to which gifts and prayers are offered, and which forms the central point of public worship. It believes in the magical virtue of outward ceremonies, especially immersion, as

* A detailed, but very unfavourable description of the Copts is given by Edward W. Lane, in his Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, 1833. Notwithstanding this, they stand higher than the other Egyptians. A. P. Stanley (Hist. of the Eastern Church, p. 95,) says of them; "The Copts are still, even in their degraded state, the most civilized of the natives; the intelligence of Egypt still lingers in the Coptic scribes, who are on this account used as clerks in the offices of their conquerors, or as registrars of the water-marks of the Nile." Compare also the occasional notices in the Egyptological writings of Wilkinson, Bunsen, Lepsius, Brugsch, and others.

the true regeneration. Singularly enough, it honours Pontius Pilate as a saint, because he washed his hands of innocent blood. The endless controversies respecting the natures of Christ, which have died out elsewhere, still rage there. The church honours saints and pictures, but not images; crosses, but not the crucifix. Every priest carries a cross in his hand, and presents it to every one whom he meets, to be kissed. The numerous churches are small and dome-shaped above, and covered with reeds and straw. On the floor lies a number of staves and crutches, on which the people support themselves during the long service, as they are without benches, like all the orientals. Slight as are its remains of Christianity, Abyssinia still stands, in agriculture, arts, laws and social condition, far above the heathen countries of Africa—a proof that even a barbaric Christianity is better than none.

The influences of the West have penetrated even to Abyssinia. The missions of the Jesuits in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and of the Protestants in the nineteenth, have been prosecuted amidst many dangers and much self-denial, yet hitherto with but little success.*

III. The ARMENIANS. These are the most numerous, interesting, and hopeful of the Monophysite sects, and now the most accessible to Protestantism. Their nationality reaches back into hoary antiquity, like Mount Ararat, at whose base lies their original home. They were converted to Christianity in the beginning of the fourth century, under King Tiridates, by Gregory the Enlightener, the first patriarch and ecclesiastical

* Especially worthy of note are the labours of the Basle missionaries, Samuel Gobat (now Anglican bishop in Jerusalem), Kugler, Isenberg, Blumhardt and Krapf, since 1830. Compare GOBAT in the Basler Missions Magazine for 1834, Heft. 1 and 2. ISENBERG: Abyssinien und die evangelische Mission, Bonn, 1844, 2 Bde. and ISENBERG and KRAPF: Journals, 1843. Also HARRIS: Highlands of Ethiopia, 1844. The imperfect fragments of an Abyssinian translation of the Bible, dating from the fourth or fifth century, have drawn the attention of Western scholars. A. Dillmann (now in Giessen) has since 1854 published the Ethiopic Old Testament, and a grammar and lexicon of the Ethiopic language. Of the older works on Abyssinia the principal are LUDOLPHUS: Historia Ethiopica, Frankf. 1681; GEDDES: Church History of Ethiopia, Lond. 1696, and LE CROZE: Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie et d'Armenie, La Haye, 1739. They have all drawn their principal materials from the Jesuits, especially from the general history of Tellez, published 1660.

writer and the greatest saint of the Armenians.* They were provided by him with monasteries and seminaries, and afterwards by Mesrob† with a version of the Scriptures, made from the Greek with the help of the Syriac Peshito; which at the same time marks the beginning of the Armenian literature, since Merrob had first to invent his alphabet. The Armenian canon has four books found in no other Bible; in the Old Testament, the history of Joseph and Asenath, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs; and in the New, the Epistle of the Corinthians to Paul and a Third Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. The next oldest work in the Armenian language is the history of their land and people, by Moses Chorenensis, a half century later.

The Armenians fell away from the church of the Greek Empire in 522, from which year they date their era. The Persians favoured the separation on political grounds, but were themselves thoroughly hostile to Christianity, and endeavoured to introduce the Zoroastrian religion into Armenia. The Armenian church, being left unrepresented at the council of Chalcedon, through the accidental absence of its bishops, accepted in 491 the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno, and at the Synod of Twin, (Thevin, or Tovin, the capital at that time,) held A. D. 595, declared decidedly for the Monophysite doctrine. The Confessio Armenica, which in other respects closely resembles the Nicene Creed, is recited by the priest at every morning service. The Armenian church had for a long time only one patriarch or Catholicus, who at first resided in Sebaste, and afterwards in the monastery of Etschmiezin, (Edschmiedsin,) their holy city, at the foot of Mount Ararat, near Erivan, (now belonging to Russia,) and had forty-two archbishops under him. At his consecration, the dead hand of

* Φωτιστής, Illuminator. He was married and had several sons. He was urgently invited to the Nicene council, but sent his son Aristax in his stead, to whom he resigned his office, and then withdrew himself for the rest of his life into a mountain cave. There are homilies of his still extant, which were first printed in 1737, in Constantinople.

† Called also Mesrop, Meserrob, Messerrop, and Murchtoz. Comp. respecting this man, and the origin of the Armenian version of the Bible, the chronicle of his pupil, Moses Chorenensis, and the article by Petermann, in *Herzog's Encycl.* Bd. ix. 320, ff.

Gregory the Enlightener is even yet always used as the medium of tactual succession. Afterwards other patriarchal sees were established, at Jerusalem (in 1311), at Sus in Cilicia (in 1440), and after the fall of the Greek Empire in Constantinople, (1461).* In 637 Armenia fell under Mohammedan dominion, and belongs now partly to Turkey, and partly to Russia. But the varying fortunes and frequent oppressions of their country have driven many thousands of the Armenians abroad, and they are now scattered in other parts of Russia and Turkey, as well as in Persia, India, and Austria.

The Armenians of the diaspora are mostly successful traders and brokers, and have become a nation and a church of merchant princes, holding great influence in Turkey. Their dispersion and love of trade; their lack of political independence; their tenacious adherence to ancient national customs and rites; the oppressions to which they are exposed in foreign countries, and the influence which they nevertheless exercise upon these countries, make their position in the Orient, especially in Turkey, similar to that of the Jews in the Christian world.

The whole number of the Armenians is very variously estimated from two and a half up to fifteen millions.†

The Armenian church, it may be remarked, has long been divided into two parts, which although internally very similar, are inflexibly opposed to each other. The *united* Armenians, since the council of Florence, A. D. 1439, have been connected with the church of Rome. To them belongs the congregation of the Mechitarists, which was founded by the Abbot Mechitar (1745), and possesses a famous monastery on the island of San Lazzaro near Venice, from which centre it has successfully laboured since 1702 for Armenian literature and education in

* Respecting the patriarchal and metropolitan sees, and the bishoprics of the Armenians, comp. Le Quien, tom. i. and Wiltsch, Kirchliche Geographie und Statistik, ii. 375 ff.

† Stanley, (History of the Eastern Church, p. 92,) supported by Neale and Hexthausen, (Transcaucasia,) estimates the number of the Armenians at over eight millions. But Dr. Wood, of New York, formerly a missionary among them, informs me that their total number does not exceed six millions, of whom two and a half millions are probably in Turkey.

the interest of the Roman Catholic church. The *schismatical* Armenians hold firmly to their peculiar doctrines and polity. They regard themselves as the orthodox, and call the united or Roman Armenians, schismatics.

Since 1830, the Protestant Missionary, Tract and Bible Societies of England, Basle, and the United States, have laboured among the Armenians, especially the Monophysite portion, with great success. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions,* in particular, has distributed Bibles and religious books in the Armenian and Armeno-Turkish language,† and founded flourishing churches and schools in Constantinople, Broosa, Nicomedia, Trebizond, Erzroom, Aintab, Kharpoot, Diarbekir, and elsewhere. Several of these churches have already endured the crucial test of persecution, and justify bright hopes for the future. As the Jewish synagogues of the diaspora were witnesses for monotheism among idolaters, and preparatory schools of Christianity, so are these Protestant Armenian churches, as well as the Protestant Nestorian, outposts of evangelical civilization in the East, and perhaps the beginning of a resurrection of primitive Christianity in the lands of the Bible, and harbingers of the future conversion of the Mohammedans.

Compare respecting the Armenian mission of the American Board the publications of this Society, Eli Smith and H. G. O. Dwight, (*Missionary Researches in Armenia*, Boston, 1833,) Dr. H. G. O. Dwight, (*Christianity Revived in the East*, N. York, 1850,) and H. Newcomb, (*Cyclopædia of Missions*, p. 124–154.) The principal missionaries among the Armenians are H. G. O. Dwight, W. Goodell, C. Hamlin, G. W. Wood, E. Riggs, D. Ladd, P. O. Powers, W. G. Schauffler, (a Wurtemberger, but educated at the Theological Seminary of Andover, Massachusetts,) and Benjamin Schneider, (a German from Pennsylvania, but likewise a graduate of Andover.)

IV. The youngest sect of the Monophysites, and the solitary

* This oldest and most extensive of American missionary societies was founded A. D. 1810, and is principally supported by the Congregationalists and New-school Presbyterians.

† The Armeno-Turkish is the Turkish language written in Armenian characters.

memorial of the Monothelite controversies, are the MARONITES, so called from St. Maron, and the eminent monastery founded by him in Syria, (400).* They inhabit the range of Lebanon, with its declivities and valleys, from Tripolis on the north, to the neighbourhood of Tyre and the lake of Gennesaret on the south, and amount, at most, to half a million. They have also small churches in Aleppo, Damascus, and other places. They are pure Syrians, and still use the Syriac language in their liturgy, but speak Arabic. They are subject to a Patriarch, who commonly resides in the monastery of Kanobin, on Mount Lebanon. They were originally *Monothelites*, even after the doctrine of one will of Christ, which is the ethical complement of the doctrine of one nature, had been rejected at the sixth œcumenical council, (A. D. 680). But after the Crusades (1182), and especially after 1596, they began to go over to the Roman church, although retaining the communion under both kinds, their Syriac missal, the marriage of priests, and their traditional fast-days, with some saints of their own, especially St. Maron. From these came, in the eighteenth century, the three celebrated Oriental scholars, the Assemani, Joseph Simon (1768), his brother Joseph Aloysius, and their cousin, Stephen Evodius. These were born on Mount Lebanon, and educated at the Maronite College at Rome.

There are also Maronites in Syria, who abhor the Roman church. Respecting the present condition of the Maronites, compare also Robinson's *Palestine*, Ritter's *Erdkunde*, (Th. 17, Abthlg. 1), and Rödiger's article in *Herzog's Encyl.* Bd. x. p. 176 ff. A few years ago (1860) the Maronites drew upon themselves the sympathies of Christendom, by the cruelties which their old hereditary enemies, the Druses, perpetrated upon them.

* He is probably the same Maron whose life Theodoret wrote, and to whom Chrysostom addressed a letter when in exile. He is not to be confounded with the later John Maron, of the tenth century, who, according to the legendary traditions of the Catholic Maronites, acting as Papal legate at Antioch, converted the whole of Lebanon to the Romish church, and became their first Patriarch. The name "Maronites" occurs first in the eighth century, and that as a name of heretics, in John of Damascus.

ART. IV.—*Life of Marcus Tullius Cicero.* By WILLIAM FORSYTH, M. A., Q. C. In two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1865.

An Account of the Life and Letters of Cicero: Translated from the German of BERNARD RUDOLPH ABEKEN. Edited by Charles Merivale, B. D. Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans. 1854.

The Life of Marcus Tullius Cicero. By CONYERS MIDDLETON, D. D. In three volumes. London. 1804.

THE character and position of Cicero were such that the most opposite views have been entertained respecting him. During his life his enemies were exceedingly bitter, but their calumnies could not blacken his memory; and whatever may be our judgment as to his political career, we must confess that we can scarcely recall a statesman even in a Christian country with so unblemished a moral character. It is singular that, with the exception of the *chef d'œuvre* of Sallust, the historians of this period of Rome are chiefly Greek. They are Plutarch, Appian and Dion Cassius; and they cannot be relied upon for a just estimate of Cicero. Plutarch is indeed impartial, but some of his statements are manifestly erroneous, and others must be received with caution. His imperfect acquaintance with Latin is partly the cause, for no more honest writer can be found. Moreover he says he wrote lives, not history; and his object was to delineate character, in which he has been most successful. Hence he often passes slightly over the most important events in a man's life, and subordinates them to dreams, jests, and anecdotes of doubtful authenticity, but which served to give point to his illustrations and comparisons. Appian is in many parts little more than a reproduction of Plutarch. Dion Cassius, who flourished in the reigns of Commodus, Septimius Severus and Alexander Severus, was not likely to take a favourable view of Cicero. Neither tyrants, nor their servants, are wont to admire patriots or their deeds. The speeches, which are introduced into Dion's work, are excellent rhetorical

productions, but that of Fufius Calenus, in which he seems to have collected all the slanders that were ever uttered against Cicero, and concentrated all the malevolence that the most bitter enemy could entertain, is a pure invention. No such speech was ever delivered, and as Forsyth says, "he would rather have put a blister on his tongue than allowed it to expose him to the castigation he was sure to receive," for there was no greater master of invective than Cicero, and even his friends suffered not unfrequently from his biting sarcasm. These charges, this "infamous stuff," as Middleton calls them, can have but little effect upon any one familiar with the history of the period, or who will impartially examine into the matter.

With the revival of letters came a new and a juster estimate of Cicero, and there is no measure to the admiration felt for him by literary men in later times. This culminated in the panegyric of Middleton and the views of Niebuhr, which provoked a strong reaction especially in Germany. Even De Quincey while admitting that in that "age, fruitful in great men, except the sublime Julian leader, none as regards splendour of endowments stood upon the same level as Cicero," and that he was "a thoughtfully conscientious man," has yet, we think, done him great injustice. Some authors have gone so far that they can find no merit in him. Abeken's Life and Letters of Cicero* (translated by Merivale), and Merivale's own works give a very fair and impartial estimate of Cicero. But we have met with nothing to equal this work of Forsyth. He has, we think, pursued the proper course in delineating the character of Cicero. He has presented him not merely as a public man, an orator and a statesman, but has made us acquainted with him as a man in all the relations of life, showing us those private virtues which are calculated to win our love, as well as those more shining qualities and brilliant achievements that excite our admiration. For this purpose he has selected as a basis, his letters, which not only reveal the man, but are more important in giving us a just and vivid conception of contemporary Roman history than any formal work that has descended to our hands. English readers have been made familiar with his letters *Ad Diversos* in the translation of

* Cicero in Seinen Briefen.

Melmoth; but as many of these were of a public and political character, they were written in a more guarded manner than those to Atticus, to which Forsyth makes constant reference, and which bring us into intimate contact with Cicero himself, and give us an insight into the very heart and soul of the man, exhibiting his daily feelings, at one time exalted to the highest pinnacle by the greatness of the deliverance he had wrought out for his country, and the honours showered upon him by a grateful senate and a saved nation; at another sick at heart, and disgusted at the ingratitude of a fickle people, an exile from his beloved Rome. At one moment we see him devoted to literature and philosophy, at another engaged in erecting villas and adorning his grounds; now indulging his taste for the fine arts, or strolling by the seashore unable to work; now immersed in politics, and trembling for the fate of his country, or mourning its lost liberty.

While Mr. Forsyth finds but little to blame in the character and career of Cicero, yet he has not been so dazzled by the splendour that surrounds his life as to present us with a mere panegyric. This biography is, upon the whole, fair, and as impartial, perhaps, as we could expect from an Englishman, in whom there would naturally be a bias towards the aristocratic side in the disputes and civil contentions that so long distracted Rome, and upon more than one occasion broke out into open war, until liberty was extinguished and the great Julius became the master of Rome, her *Imperator*, in a new sense of the term.

On a hill rising above the valley of the Liris, and near its junction with the Fibrenus, was situated Arpinum, an ancient city of the Volscians. The remains of the ancient walls, still extant, show it to have been, in early times, a city of no little importance. More than 300 B. C. it fell into the hands of the Romans, but did not obtain the franchise until 188 B. C., the year in which Rome ratified the peace with Antiochus. Although a considerable town, it owes its celebrity to the fact that it gave birth to two of the most illustrious men of Rome, each of them the saviour of his country, the one by repelling barbarian invasion from her borders, the other by crushing a conspiracy in her capital; the one, Marius, the rude soldier,

seven times consul, the other, Cicero, the polished scholar, Rome's most eloquent orator. Not far from Arpinum the little river Fibrenus bursts forth suddenly from the ground and sends its clear cold water in a deep and rapid stream into the Liris. Just before its junction with the latter river, and less than three miles from Arpinum, it forms an island, now S. Domenico, the beauty of which is still attested by the presence of a convent upon it. Upon this island stood the paternal villa where Cicero was born. His father subsequently enlarged it, and being in feeble health passed most of his life here in the pursuit of literature. In after years Atticus wondered that Cicero, when absent from Rome, could be contented elsewhere than in this villa so delightfully situated and so handsomely arranged. (*De Legibus*, II. 1, 2, 3.)

Marcus Tullius Cicero was born on the 3d day of January, A. U. 647, B. C. 106,* Coss. C. Atilius Serranus and Q. Servilius Cæpio, the same year in which Cn. Pompeius was born, and in which Marius ended the Jugurthine war. His parents were of equestrian rank, and therefore possessed of considerable fortune;† but no member of the family had ever filled any curule office. His family was thus plebeian, although some wished to trace the Tullian gens back to Tullius Attius, a Volscian king. But the family name Tullius was probably derived from the situation of the residence, (*Tullius*—"fountain" or "stream"), and the surname Cicero from some ancestor who had excelled in the cultivation of the *cicer*, while Marcus was the name always given to the oldest son of the family. His grandfather was of the stern old Roman type, and his father was a friend of the principal personages at Rome. His mother, Helvia, is never mentioned by Cicero. We only know that she was of good family, wealthy, and an excellent housewife. His grandfather used to say that his countrymen were like Syrian slaves, the better they knew Greek the worse they were; but his father, who was a man of literary culture, did not share this prejudice, which, a few years later, so completely

* October, B. C. 107, according to the calendar as reformed by Julius Cæsar, B. C. 46.

† In the reign of Augustus, the Census of the Equites was fixed at 400,000 sesterces, (about $16,300.)

disappeared at Rome, that even Cato, the Censor, began the study of Greek in his old days. The talents and the attainments of young Cicero were such, according to Plutarch, as to excite the admiration of the parents of some of his fellow-students, and the envy of others. His father removed to Rome that his sons, Marcus and Quintus, who was four years younger, might enjoy the advantages of education which the capital afforded. With their cousins, the sons of C. Aculeo, they attended the lectures of the Greek professors whom Crassus, the orator, recommended and had employed for his own instruction.

Among the instructors of Cicero was the poet Archias, in whose defence he subsequently delivered one of his finest orations. Through his influence he began to write poetry. He wrote with great facility and some nerve, but lacked the divine afflatus. The effect of his study of Greek, that greatest instrument of education the world has ever contained, is manifest throughout his whole career as an orator and a writer. Besides his intercourse with his teachers, although only a boy, he associated much with Crassus and Antonius, the grandfather of the triumvir, who then shared the palm of eloquence at Rome.

At the customary age of sixteen Cicero assumed the toga pura, or virilis, before the Prætor in the Forum, and having passed along the Sacra Via to the Capitol, and there offered a sacrifice to Jupiter, he was henceforth permitted to enter upon the business and struggle of life. The coloured border had now disappeared from his robe, and could not re-appear until success crowned his efforts for magisterial rank and honour. Cicero now devoted himself most assiduously to the study of law under Quintus Mucius Scævola, the augur, the most distinguished lawyer of his day, and after his death with his cousin, the Pontifex Maximus, who bore the same name, and whom Cicero calls the most eloquent of lawyers, and the most learned of orators. The Roman lawyer was accustomed to give his advice gratuitously to all who would consult him, either at his own home, or during his walks in the Forum. These *responsa prudentum*, made to the suitors, were treasured up by the students for their own guidance. Popularity and influence were gained by the gratuitous defence of persons accused, or by the prosecution of magistrates guilty of mal-

feasance in office. Cicero declares that he scarcely ever quitted the side of the elder Scævola. He attended diligently in all the courts, and in the Forum, that he might hear the most eloquent orators, and by constant practice in private, both in composition and declamation, prepare himself for his future career. No branch of study was neglected. We know from his *De Oratore* (I. 6,) how exalted was his conception of the office, and of what should be the attainments of the orator: Ac mea quidem sententia nemo poterit esse omni laude cumulatus orator, nisi erit omnium rerum magnarum atque artium scientiam consecutus. Professio ipsa bene dicendi hoc suscipere ac polliceri videtur ut omni de re, quæcumque sit proposita, ornate ab eo copioseque dicatur.

A knowledge of the art of war was an indispensable part of a liberal Roman education. As this could be acquired only in the field, Cicero, now in his nineteenth year, embraced the opportunity of the Social or Italic war to serve his only campaign under Cn. Pompeius Strabo, the father of Pompey the Great.

During the stormy period that now succeeded under Marius and Cinna, he devoted himself to philosophy with Philo the Athenian, *princeps academiæ*, who had fled to Rome; to rhetoric with Molo the Rhodian, an excellent advocate and teacher; to dialectics with Diodotus, the Stoic. "Noctes et dies," he says, "in omnium doctrinarum meditatione versabar." (*Brutus*, c. 90.) All the great orators of Rome had either been most cruelly slain, or were absent from Rome. Crassus had died, and Antonius, whose eloquence was such that the soldiers sent to slay him could not obey their commander, had been slain by the officer himself. Cicero prepared himself to take their vacant places by constantly declaiming, and oftener in Greek than in Latin, to enrich his style, and to enjoy the criticism of his Greek teachers, and also by listening to those who spoke in the Forum. About this time he produced his earliest prose work, which was probably his *De Inventione*. His leisure was devoted to the society of the most cultivated ladies of Rome, the purity and delicacy of whose Latin refined his taste, and are doubtless reflected in his own admirable style.

With the restoration of quiet to the republic many of the

banished orators returned, and he now began to plead both public and private causes in the Forum, whither he came most thoroughly prepared, at the age of twenty-four. The first of his extant speeches is that for Publius Quintius, delivered when he was twenty-five years old, and in which he was opposed by Hortensius, who was even then at the head of the bar in Rome, (*primas in caussis agebat.*) Like Demosthenes, his first appearance in a public or criminal trial was in the twenty-seventh year of his age. This was in defence of Sextus Roscius, of Ameria, who was accused of parricide, and who was prosecuted, not only by his own relatives, but by Chrysogonus, a favourite and freedman of Sylla, then at the heighth of his power. The courage manifested in this trial, and his boldness, not only in attacking Chrysogonus, but in criticising even the acts of the dictator himself, produced the most favourable impression as to his talents and character. This was the crisis of his career. Successful in this effort, his business, he informs us, greatly increased, and no cause was considered too great to be entrusted to him, *non digna nostro patrocinio.*

At this time Cicero says of himself, (*Brutus* xci.) that he was lean and weak, with a long, thin neck, and in consequence of weak lungs was unable to continue his arduous labours. His impassioned style of speaking, with the most vehement gestures, and his voice pitched to its utmost, undermined his health; and by the advice of friends and physicians, after a career of only two years, in which, however, he had gained the highest reputation, he left Rome and set out for Asia, both for the benefit of his health and the improvement, or rather the complete change of his style of speaking. He proceeded first to Athens, where he spent six months, exercising himself most diligently in rhetoric and renewing his favourite study of philosophy, which however he had never entirely remitted. He frequented the Old Academy under Antiochus, and through the influence of his life-long friend, T. Pomponius, subsequently surnamed Atticus, from his love of Athens and the Athenians, he also attended the lectures of Zeno and Phædrus, disciples of Epicurus. At this time he was probably initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries, from which he gained new and higher views both of life and of religion (*De Legg.* ii. 14; *Tusc.*

Quæst. i. 13). He traversed Asia Minor in company with the most distinguished orators, engaging with them in the constant practice of rhetoric. (*Brutus* xci. 315, 316.) At Rhodes his old teacher, Molo, again gave him instruction, endeavouring particularly to correct his redundant and exaggerated style of speaking. Thus, after an absence of two years he returned to Rome with health completely restored, not only a more practised, but an almost changed orator (*non modo exercitatior, sed prope mutatus*). Not even Demosthenes was more assiduous or more successful in his oratorical culture than Cicero. His travels, his studies, and above all, his Greek culture at Athens, prepared him to resume his old position at the bar, where Cotta and Hortensius now reigned supreme. While he was absent from Rome, Sylla, whose cruelty was only equalled by the greatness of his deeds, had abdicated his power and died; Pompey had already won the title of Great, and forced the honour of a triumph from an unwilling Senate and a reluctant Dictator, while the youthful Cæsar had gained a civic crown, the simple but most illustrious reward of military valour.

Cicero resumed his duties of advocate; but his oratorical efforts were only preparatory to his political career, upon which he now entered. Eloquence was a passport to political preferment in Rome, although corruption had already sapped the ancient public virtue, and gold was a potent influence in the Roman canvass, which was reduced to as complete a system as among ourselves. The Quæstorship was the first office to which the Roman statesman aspired, as this gave entrance to the Senate, and was the stepping-stone to the higher offices. To this office Cicero was elected in the thirty-first year of his age, the earliest period at which he was eligible according to Roman law. It is a remarkable coincidence that this same year, B. C. 76, witnessed the elevation to office of the three most eloquent orators of their time—Cicero to the quæstorship, Hortensius to the ædileship, and Cotta to the consulship. About this time Cicero married Terentia, a lady, probably of noble birth and of considerable fortune, and his daughter, Tullia, to whom he was so tenderly attached, was born in Aug. B. C. 76. Sicily was called the granary of Rome, and the lot assigned to Cicero the province of Lilybæum in this

island, whither he repaired the next year, B. C. 75. He devoted himself most assiduously to his duties, and although it was a period of scarcity at Rome, he managed to supply the city without oppressing the Sicilians. His integrity and humanity were such as to win the love and gratitude of the people, who decreed him extraordinary honours at his departure. An incident of his life here, was his discovery of the tomb of Archimedes near the city of Syracuse. He still cultivated oratory in his intervals of leisure, and returned to Rome with his powers, according to his own estimate (*Brutus* xcii., 318), perfectly matured. His vanity was much chagrined by finding that the fame of his excellent administration had not reached Rome. He tells a good story against himself; that landing at Puteoli, he met a friend who inquired when he had left Rome, and what the news was there. "I have just come from my province," Cicero answered. "From Africa, I believe," said the other. "No; from Sicily," replied Cicero with some anger. A by-stander who wished to appear well-informed, turned and said, "What! do you not know that this gentleman has been quæstor at Syracuse?" when his province had been that of Lilybæum. He laid aside his anger, and says that this incident was of as much benefit to him as if all had congratulated him. Perceiving that the Romans had dull ears, but sharp eyes, he henceforth kept himself ever before the people, stuck close to the Forum (*pressi forum*), and allowed neither his janitor nor sleep to deny approach to him. (*Or. pro Plancio*, 26, 27.) Although constantly engaged in pleading during the next four or five years, not a single speech or fragment remains. The same year in which Pompey and Crassus became consuls, the former being exempted by the Senate from the usual legal requirements of age and previous office, Cicero became a candidate for the office of Curule Ædile, to which he was unanimously elected. Before entering upon his duties he undertook the celebrated prosecution of Verres, who, as proprætor of Sicily, had been guilty of oppression, rapacity, and tyranny so flagrant as to be without a parallel even in that age of corruption, when the spoils of a province were looked forward to, to defray the expenses of elections at home and the extravagance of life at Rome. Appeal to Rome was usually

vain, for the tribunals were corrupted by the proceeds of the very oppression against which appeal was made. The Sicilians besought Cicero to come forward in their behalf, and he willingly consented. As a trial could not be avoided, Verres and his friends were anxious that some one should be employed as prosecutor who would betray the cause. Q. Cæcilius Niger, the quæstor of Verres in Sicily, claimed the right to prosecute; but Cicero, in his speech, *In Cæcilium*, or *De Divinatione*, (so called because the decision was rendered on argument without evidence, as if by *divination*,) noted for its keen wit and biting sarcasm, successfully vindicated his claim. One hundred and ten days were allowed him to collect the evidence, and to prepare for the trial. Within fifty days he had gone over Sicily, and accumulated an overwhelming mass of evidence, gathered from all the principal cities, save Messana, which still favoured Verres. With these documents, and a large body of witnesses who accompanied him, he was ready for the trial, which Verres and his party sought to postpone until the next year, when Hortensius and Metellus would be consuls, and another Metellus prætor, all his personal and political friends, through whose influence and that of his wealth he hoped to escape. Sufficient time was not left for the ordinary slow mode of trial, and Cicero, therefore, reversed the usual course of procedure, and abandoning all his carefully prepared speeches, except the *Interrogatio Testium*, presented at once his witnesses and his evidence. Before an august tribunal of Roman Senators, assembled in the Temple of Castor and Pollux, and presided over by Glabrio, the city Prætor, the criminal was arrayed, while the Forum, the declivities of the neighbouring hills, and even the housetops, were filled with countless multitudes, many of whom were personally interested in the trial, and had flocked to Rome "to behold a criminal who had scourged and crucified Roman citizens, who had respected neither local nor national shrines, and who boasted that wealth would even yet rescue the murderer, the violator, and the temple-robber, from the hand of man, and from the Nemesis of the gods."

But nothing could save him, neither the eloquence of Hortensius, nor the interests of friends availed, and Verres was condemned to banishment and the payment of a fine of nearly

two hundred thousand dollars. The trial continued for nine days, but Verres left Rome before it was finished. This was a great triumph for Cicero, when we remember how corrupt the courts had become.

Cicero subsequently published the five orations against Verres which he had not delivered, and which are scarcely surpassed by the fierce invective of the Catilinarian orations or the terrible attacks of his Philippics. He now entered upon his duties as Ædile, B. C. 69, and discharged them in such a manner as to gratify the people who were extremely fond of public shows and games, and yet not to involve himself in debt, as was so frequently the case at this period. Having been Ædile, he was henceforth enrolled among the nobles and became possessed of large property. The sources of his wealth are uncertain; but Forsyth thinks they were chiefly two, presents from foreign states of which he was the patron, and legacies from friends.* About this time he probably acquired his villa at Tusculum, to which many others were subsequently added, and to the adornment of which he devoted much of his time and his money. He was always careful to put a soul, *i. e.*, a library, into his house. He still continued his profession of advocate, and after the usual interval of three years he was unanimously elected Prætor Urbanus, B. C. 67, at the age of 40, and entered upon his duties the next year. Owing to the disturbed condition of affairs consequent upon the passage of the Gabinian law, giving Pompey the command of the war against the pirates, of that of Otho assigning separate seats in the theatre to the knights, and of the Calpurnian law against bribery in elections, the comitia were held no less than three times before a valid election occurred; but Cicero was each time unanimously chosen City Prætor. The lot assigned to him criminal jurisdiction, and he gained both the reputation of integrity and popularity with the people by his judicial decisions.

Pompey was now at the height of his fame, and he fairly dazzled the people, of whose party he was an acknowledged leader, by the brilliancy of his exploits. Other men had sown the seed, and he had reaped the benefit. Thrice had fortune

* Philipp. ii. 40. He states with pride that he had received from legacies more than 20,000,000 of sesterces, or upwards of $800,000.

rather than merit given Pompey the honour of a triumph; and again was he to enter into the labours of another. Lucullus, one of the ablest and most humane of Roman commanders, had waged war against Mithridates for seven years, and just as he was upon the point of complete success his army mutinied and his government failed to support him. The tribune Manilius proposed a law to supersede him, and to confer upon Pompey the supreme command. The Senate opposed in vain, for the people favoured it, and Cæsar from various motives, and even Cicero supported it. The latter was now in full view of the consulship, the highest object of his ambition, and his eloquence was the power by which he hoped to attain it. His speech in favour of the Manilian law was the first he delivered from the Rostra, and is one of the best specimens of his eloquence. The portrait he here paints of Pompey as a general and as a man, naturally suggests a suspicion of his motives, but he solemnly protests that he was actuated only by the highest patriotism.

Pompey received the command with pretended aversion, and proceeded against the already conquered Mithridates, who sued for peace, but was repulsed, and after a series of misfortunes at length perished by his own command at the hands of an attendant. It is said that when Pompey and Lucullus met, the bays that wreathed the fasces of the former were dry and withered, while those of the latter were green and flourishing. The lictors of the one offered fresh leaves to those of the other; a sign that Pompey should gather the rewards of the victories Lucullus had won. But this mention of Pompey and the Manilian law has led us away from our subject. At the end of his prætorship instead of taking a provincial government, as was customary, Cicero remained at home, and devoted the two years that must necessarily intervene between the office of prætor and that of consul, to his canvass for that exalted position. The chief families of Rome reserved the consulship and the censorship for themselves, and looked with contempt upon the efforts of a "novus homo" to obtain so eminent a position. He made use of every honourable means, but especially of his eloquence in the forum and of his abilities as an advocate, to gain the suffrages of the people. There were six other candidates,

among whom was Catiline, if he could escape from a criminal prosecution for pecuniary corruption in his provincial government in Africa, then impending over him. Strange to say, Cicero was willing to defend him in this, or in some other trial, and even to coalesce with him in the canvass! This is a matter difficult to explain, and even his warmest admirers have to admit a want of consistency in his conduct, unless indeed, as he intimates in his speech for Cælius, he was deceived in the character of the man. "Political necessity," however, may be the best explanation. Just previous to the election such was the course of some of his opponents that he delivered a most bitter invective *in Togâ candidâ* against Catiline and Antonius, who were supported by Cæsar and Crassus among others. Bribery and corruption at Rome were unblushing in that day, and society was on the verge of destruction, government ready to totter into anarchy. There had been intimations of a conspiracy to overthrow the state, and whispers had connected with it even the names of Cæsar and of Crassus, but there was no evidence to sustain the charge. The leaders of the oligarchy or senatorial party foresaw the coming storm and determined to profit by its occurrence. They hated Cicero, and yet saw that he was the favourite of the people, and could alone save the state. They hoped to use him as their instrument, and to employ his abilities, his eloquence, and his patriotism, not simply for the good of the state, but to carry out the objects of their party. Both parties, therefore, joined to promote his election, and he was elevated to the consulship, B. C. 64, not merely by ballot, but by loud shouts, not simply by a majority, but as it were by the voice of all orders and of the whole Roman people.

He had now reached the summit of his ambition, the first new man who had been elected Consul of Rome in a generation, and in the first year that he was eligible. He entered upon the duties of his office January 1, B. C. 63. His inaugural speech announced his course of action. He declared that he should seek no province, no honour, other than the gratitude and esteem of his countrymen, and the consciousness of having well served the state. His course in office, however,

was such as to favour the senatorial party, even when preserving the state.

About thirty years before the birth of Cicero, Tiberius Gracchus, a young Roman, of warm heart and ardent imagination, of high education, and a genuine lover of the people, was upon a journey from Rome to Spain. He passed through cities once renowned, but now degenerated, through a fertile country once teeming with population, but now cultivated only by the slaves of a few lordly proprietors. The land that had once been distributed among a nation, had by right of conquest become the property of the state, and save the portions assigned to the colonies, had been consigned to the wealthiest and most powerful families at a merely nominal rent. These estates descended by inheritance, and the nobles looked upon them not as belonging to the state, but as their own private possessions. The absence of the owners, the cultivation of the soil by slaves, the change from agriculture to pasture, the diminution of population in the country, the crowding into cities, the degradation of the people, and all the evils attendant upon the system, forced themselves upon the mind of the traveller. He found this state of things existing throughout Italy, and without considering other reasons, thought that the mode of tenure of the public lands was the sole cause, and that the destruction of this monopoly would remedy all these evils. It was thus that Tiberius Gracchus conceived, or rather revived the idea of an Agrarian Law, that should destroy the usurpation of the nobles, and divide the public domain amongst the people; but even this was not to be done without compensation to the actual possessors of the land. The Lex Sempronia cost its author his life, and every effort to remove pauperism from Rome by an Agrarian law, which was but a simple act of justice, met with the most determined opposition upon the part of the nobles, and usually led to scenes of violence. Rullus, a tribune, proposed such a law at the beginning of Cicero's consulship. Cicero was placed in a peculiar position. He had hitherto depended upon the people, and now he was called upon to oppose a measure apparently designed for their benefit. Fragments only of his speech in the senate against it remain, but his two speeches to the people are still extant, the

first of which Niebuhr pronounces "one of the most brilliant achievements of eloquence." He thanked them most cordially for their uniform support of himself, and their elevation of him to the consulship upon his first application, and in a manner unlike that of any whom they could remember. Having thus conciliated them, he proceeded to praise the Gracchi, and to declare himself in favour of the principle of an Agrarian Law, but objected to the details of the one under consideration. After his second speech the bill was withdrawn, most probably through the influence of Cæsar, who had employed Rullus, his partisan, to thus undermine the popularity of Cicero. His popularity suffered again by his opposition to the effort to restore their political rights to the descendants of those who had been proscribed by Sylla. His eloquence caused expediency to prevail over justice. His next triumph was in an extempore speech for that Otho who was the author of the law assigning separate seats in the theatre to the knights. Other speeches of this period we need not notice.

We now approach the most important event, not only of Cicero's consulship, but one which had no slight effect in shaping the destiny of the Republic. We allude, of course, to the conspiracy of Catiline. In reference to this matter but one opinion prevailed in ancient times; and after making every deduction for the rhetorical exaggeration of Cicero, the character of Catiline remains the blackest of the Romans who preceded the Empire; and no effort of modern times can remove the stains. The portrait, both of the person and of the character of the great conspirator, drawn by Sallust, who was an enemy of Cicero, can be effaced from the memory of none who has perused his immortal work. To him, therefore, and not to Cicero, would we appeal for testimony as to the man and the period.

In the middle of the sketch of his vices, his companions, his influence over them, and the purposes for which he employed them, occurs that memorable description: "Namque animus impurus, dis hominibusque infestus, neque vigiliis, neque quietibus sedari poterat; ita conscientia mentem excitam vastabat. Igitur colos exsanguis, fœdi oculi, citus modo, modo tardus

incessus; prorsus in facie vultuque vecordia inerat."* His courage and his abilities were not even surpassed by his vices; and Cicero says of him, "Neque ego unquam fuisse tale monstrum in terris ullum puto, tam ex contrariis diversisque inter se pugnantibus naturæ studiis cupiditatibusque conflatum."† Niebuhr says, "He was so completely diabolical that I know no one in history that can be compared with him." His conspiracy to slay the consuls as they entered upon office, Jan. 1, 65, B. C. had failed. Defeated once, he was now a second time a candidate for the consulship, and it was expected that a second repulse would drive him into another conspiracy. His measures were carefully but secretly prepared both within and without the city. Cicero succeeded in gaining a complete knowledge of all the designs of Catiline and his accomplices. His own life was in danger, and the Senate secretly conferred upon the consuls dictatorial power, while Cicero held the election, clothed in armour and surrounded by an armed guard. Again was Catiline rejected; and maddened by his defeat he assembled his accomplices and resolved upon immediate action. The two assassins sent to murder Cicero in the early dawn of Nov. 7th, 63 B. C. (really Jan. 11th, 62 B. C.) were refused admittance because he had been forwarned by Fulvia; and he summoned the Senate to meet in the temple of Jupiter Stator on the next day. Catiline also had the audacity to appear; but none addresssed him, every senator shunned his approach. This was the occasion of Cicero's terrible invective, the First Oration against Catiline. The attempt of the latter to reply was drowned amid the general execration and cries of "Traitor!" and "Parricide." Then becoming furious, and threatening "to extinguish in the common ruin the conflagration that threatened him," he rushed forth from the Senate. Leaving to the conspirators still within the walls the execution of the designs in the city, he betook himself by night to the camp of Manlius in Etruria, who had assembled an army of no less than twenty thousand awaiting the orders of Catiline.

Cicero's Second Oration against Catiline was delivered to the people in the Forum on the morning of Nov. 9th, in which

* Sall. Catilina, xv. † Or. pro Cælio, 12.

he rejoiced at the flight of Catiline, and expressed the wish that all his partisans would follow him, assuring them of every facility for their escape. Catiline and Manlius were declared public enemies by the Senate, and to the Consul Antonius, whom Cicero had won over to the cause of his country, was given the command of the army, while to Cicero was committed the care of the city. Through Volturcius, one of the conspirators, and the ambassadors of the Allobroges, who were vainly seeking for justice at the hands of the Senate, Cicero obtained legal proofs of the guilt of Lentulus, Cethegus, and others. Confronted with the evidence, they acknowledged their guilt, and were committed to the custody of some of the most distinguished senators, amongst whom were Cæsar and Crassus, against whom there were suspicions of complicity in the conspiracy, but without any just foundations, according to the declaration of Cicero himself. From the Temple of Concord in which the Senate met, he proceeded to the Rostra, but a few feet distant, and delivered the Third Oration against Catiline, in which he set forth the evidence against the prisoners, and attributed his success to the guidance of the gods, and especially of Jupiter Maximus, whose statue had been placed in the Capitol on that very day. For himself who had, indeed, saved (*servavi*) the city, he asked from the people "no reward of virtue, no mark of honour, no monument of praise, save the everlasting memory of that day." "In your memory, Romans, shall our actions be cherished, through your conversation shall they increase, in the monuments of literature shall they become fixed and strengthened: and I feel that the same day, which I hope will be everlasting, is consecrated both to the safety of the city and the recollection of my consulship." With a request for protection against his enemies, an exhortation to piety and vigilance upon their part, and a promise of watchfulness upon his, he dismissed them. The people perceiving the dangers they had escaped, and appreciating the patriotism and labours of Cicero, exalted him to the height of popularity;* while the Senate decreed a thanksgiving for his services, an honour never before conferred upon a civilian.

And now came the question of the punishment of the con-

* Ciceronem ad cœlum tollere. Sall. Cat. 48.

spirators. They had been declared public enemies, and in the view of the Senatorial party, the Consuls having been invested with dictatorial powers, could immediately put them to death. But Cicero, knowing the popular feeling, especially as manifested in the recent condemnation of Rabirius, simply for constructive participation in the death of Satiominus, referred the matter directly to the Senate. That body assembled in the Temple of Concord December 5, 63 B. C., (February 7, 62 B. C.,) to deliberate upon the question. Silanus, the Consul elect, gave his opinion in favour of death, as did all who had been Consuls; but Cæsar pronounced in favour of perpetual imprisonment, with confiscation. His speech produced a great impression, and would probably have decided the Senate to pursue the milder course, but for two speeches that followed. The one was Cicero's Fourth Oration against Catiline, the other that of Cato, one of the purest men, and most incorruptible statesmen of Rome, and at the same time one of the most zealous partisans of the Senate, and utterly impracticable. Cicero set forth the importance of their decision to the safety of the Commonwealth, and intimated the danger to himself of the severest course, and by declaring his willingness to obey whatever might be their decree, showed that he was not "disinclined to the capital sentence." The speech of Cato in favour of the sentence of death sealed the fate of the criminals, and the Senate passed the decree in his very words, condemning Lentulus, Cethegus, Gabinius, and Statilius, and Cæparius to death. Cicero immediately conveyed the prisoners to that most horrible prison, the *Tullianum*, where Jugurtha perished, and where tradition says St. Peter was afterwards confined, and delivered them to the executioners. When all was over, Cicero, to the thronging, awe-struck people in the Forum below, announced their fate in the single terrible word, "*Vixerunt!*" For his patriotism Cato hailed him "Father of his country," and the shouts of the people who accompanied him home through the illuminated streets confirmed the title.

Catiline, deserted by all his troops save four thousand, and unable to escape into Gaul, soon after perished in battle, fighting bravely; and his head was sent as a trophy to Rome. The suppression of the conspiracy was the greatest deed of Cicero's

life; the evening of the day upon which the conspirators were executed he ever considered the proudest moment of his life. And yet to this day may be traced all his subsequent misfortunes. Immersed as he was in public affairs, he still found time for the duties of an advocate. At this very time, in connection with Hortensius and Crassus, he defended Murena, the Consul elect, against the charge of bribery. Cato was the prosecutor, and Cicero, by his amusing representation of Cato's stoical philosophy, and particularly by showing the danger of having only one Consul, secured the acquittal of Murena, Cato only remarking, "What a witty Consul we have." The end of his Consulship was now approaching, and he was prepared, as was the custom, to give an account of it to the people from the Rostra. But he was doomed to disappointment. The leaders of the popular party and the friends of Catiline were now active against him, while the leaders of the Senatorial party, who never loved him, and were jealous of his public services, were prepared to sacrifice him.

Great and undoubted as was the guilt of the conspirators, it had not been judicially determined, and their instant capital punishment was wrong; "it was worse than a crime—it was a blunder." Roman law did not give to the Senate the power of inflicting the penalty of death, but expressly forbade any citizen to be put to death, except by a vote of the tribes; and by voluntary exile the criminal could escape even this tribunal. Cicero had been the instrument of the Senate, and when he came to lay down his office on the 31st of December, Metellus Nepos, one of the Tribunes, forbade him to speak, an insult never offered to a magistrate before, and he could only swear aloud, "I alone have saved the Republic," while Senators, Knights, and people spontaneously echoed the cry, "You have spoken true." Thus ended Cicero's extraordinary official career, and from the view we have taken of it, we can well understand that a man, such as Cicero, might well feel elated in contemplating it. His vanity was great, and yet in view of its occasion it was pardonable. But there were those who could not endure his constant declaration that he was "the Saviour of Rome, the Father of his country." The blow, however, which was to afflict him so severely, came from an unexpected source.

Cæsar, the shrewdest politician in Rome, had been elected Pontifex Maximus over Catulus, the wisest and best leader of the Senatorial party, and had also secured his election as Prætor. The mysteries of the Bona Dea were celebrated at his house. Only women were allowed to be present, but Clodius, one of the most corrupt of the young nobles, was discovered present in disguise. Cæsar divorced his wife because "Cæsar's wife must be above suspicion." When Clodius was brought to trial the next year he attempted to prove an alibi. Cicero, however, testified that Clodius had been at his house on that very day, and thus incurred his undying hatred. Pompey had treated Cicero coolly, because in a letter to himself he had compared his efforts to suppress the Catilinarian conspiracy with the former's Eastern conquest. He had taken Jerusalem while Cicero was Consul, and from the time he entered the Holy of Holies, victory is said never to have rested upon his arms. He had now returned to Rome, and after some resistance upon the part of the Senate, had been granted a triumph which had been most magnificently celebrated. Being asked in the Senate what he thought of the sacrilege of Clodius and the bill to select judges for his trial, he delivered a non-committal speech, praising the Senate, &c. Crassus then took occasion to deliver a panegyric upon Cicero, lauding him to the skies, and this gave Cicero an opportunity to deliver the great speech he had prepared for the close of his Consulship. His account of the speech, and of its enthusiastic reception, given in a letter to Atticus, (I. 14,) is very entertaining. Cicero had always endeavoured to unite the equestrian and the senatorial orders, but there was constant danger of rupture. Clodius was acquitted through the grossest corruption of the judges, many of whom were Knights, and when the Senate wished to investigate the matter, he sided with the Knights in resisting the proposal, although he thought them in the wrong. So also he supported them in their demand to be released from a losing contract in reference to the revenues of Asia Minor. This separation of the orders was injurious to him, and he thought detrimental to the State also. Cicero, therefore, saw the necessity of attaching himself to some power-

ful friend to secure his personal safety, and to preserve the authority of the state unimpaired. He selected Pompey. Forsyth says "that Cicero always mistrusted Pompey, and Pompey disliked Cicero." Each was desirous, however, of using the other to accomplish his purposes; and to all public appearance they were on the most intimate terms, each one flattering the other; Pompey at one time declaring that his achievements would have been in vain had Cicero not saved the city for him to triumph in, while Cicero declared there was only one statesman left, meaning Pompey. But it was impossible for the Senate and Pompey to work harmoniously together. He demanded a complete ratification of all his acts in the East, and it was refused. Through Flavius, the tribune, he proposed an Agrarian Law for the benefit of his veterans, and although supported by Cicero in a modified form, it was rejected. Thus Pompey thought again of the people, but Cæsar had supplanted him. Crassus, who hated Pompey, had furnished Cæsar with a million of dollars to relieve his most pressing necessities, and he had commenced his military career in Spain. He now (B. C. 60) returned to Rome to claim a triumph, and to stand for the Consulship. To obtain the latter, he must enter the city; to secure the former, he must remain without; and as the Senate would not relax the law in his favour, he sacrificed the triumph to the Consulship, although in Bibulus he received a most factious colleague.

At this time was formed the First Triumvirate, supported by "the military glory of Pompey, the wealth of Crassus, and the popularity of Cæsar," each member of which thought he would ultimately obtain the supreme power. How now was Cicero, who was always a true patriot, although sometimes mistaken as to the best course, how was he to act? The Triumvirate desired and sought his support, and united with them, to use his own language, he could expect "reconciliation with his enemies, peace with the multitude, and repose for his old age." "But, then," as Forsyth says, "what would become of his political principles? Was he to abandon the cause of the Republic, and the course he had followed from his youth, to make himself an instrument in the hands of others, and surrender his free will to theirs? * * He held aloof,

determined to temporize, and not to commit himself to an alliance, which, it was his firm conviction, threatened ruin to the Republic. He did not, however, wish to break altogether with three such powerful men, whose hostility he would have to encounter almost alone, for he could count on no effective support in his own, that is, the conservative party. This gave his conduct the appearance of vacillation; but it may well be doubted whether he could at this juncture have acted more wisely than he did."

As we have already stated, corruption, bribery, and immorality everywhere prevailed; and nought could have saved the Republic. Cicero fondly dreamed that it might be preserved. "Blinded by his attachment to ancient forms—an ardent lover of temperate liberty—conservative in all his views—he could not bring himself to believe that the old constitution was worn out, and that, while the form remained, the spirit and the life were gone. Those who move with the tide are hardly conscious of the rate at which the tide is flowing, and come upon the rocks before they are aware." Forsyth cannot, as does De Quincey, give Cæsar credit for patriotic motives in overthrowing the Republic, but in a single paragraph, which we cannot refrain from quoting, he does justice to his truly great talents. "That he was one of the greatest of soldiers—and all but one of the greatest of orators—a consummate statesman—a wise ruler when he had attained the summit of his power—magnanimous and humane towards his enemies when he could afford to despise them, though pitilessly cruel when he had an object to gain,—all this we may freely admit; but it ought not to alter our opinion as to his nefarious plot against the constitution and liberties of Rome, nor blind our eyes to the fact that he was unscrupulously and selfishly ambitious." And here is the companion portrait of his great rival. "Pompey was weak and vainglorious; utterly unfit to stand against his giant competitor, or confront the dangers which overwhelmed the sinking state. No man could do this who was not gifted by nature with a genius for military command,—for the sword must ultimately decide the struggle,—and in the hour of trial it was found that, whatever reputation he might have gained against the barbarians of Spain—

the half-civilized forces of Mithridates—or the pirate hordes of the Mediterranean,—he was deficient in the great qualities of a soldier, and was as feeble in the conduct of a campaign as he was infirm of purpose in the senate."

Cicero continued to practise his profession of advocate, and in the course of his defence of his former colleague, Antonius, he made some remarks upon public matters, which being misreported to the triumvirs enraged them, and they permitted Clodius, his sworn enemy, to be adopted into a plebeian gens, that he might become a tribune of the people, and thus be in a position to avenge himself on Cicero. He was at this time absent from Rome for some months, passing his time at his different villas; and his letters show his disgust at politics and his profound dissatisfaction at the state of affairs. He declined to be one of the commissioners to carry out Cæsar's agrarian law, or to be an ambassador to Egypt. He was now thinking of beginning his literary career. He says to Atticus, "To these," *i. e.*, literature and philosophy, "I purpose to devote myself; would that I had done so from the first! Now, however, that I know by experience the vanity of those things I once thought so brilliant, I intend to pay court to all the Muses." He had already written an account of his consulship in Greek and sent it to Atticus to be "published" at Athens, and had collected in a volume the orations he had delivered while consul. Cæsar now received his command for five years, in Gaul and Illyricum, and really desirous of saving Cicero, offered him the post of lieutenant, which he nominally accepted, but preferred to remain at Rome and fight out his battle with Clodius, who had now been elected one of the tribunes. The triumvirate had become very unpopular, while Cicero had recovered his former popularity and Clodius had sworn to Pompey that he would do him no harm. But this oath he had no intention of keeping. The consuls of the year B. C. 58, were men of the worst character, and Clodius gained their support by promising them select provisional governments. He ingratiated himself with the three orders, and finally proposed to the people the following law: "Be it enacted, that whoever has put to death a Roman citizen uncondemned in due form of trial, shall be interdicted from fire and water."

It was aimed at Cicero, although he was not named. Knowing his danger, and feeling that his only hope was in exciting the sympathy of the people, he clothed himself in mourning and went about the streets appealing to their compassion. The whole equestrian class also put on mourning, and twenty thousand of the noblest young men of Rome changed their dress and accompanied him in the streets. Deputations from distant towns appealed to the consuls for his protection. The Senate resolved to go into mourning, but the consul Gabinus sternly forbade them, and his colleague, Piso, repulsed every appeal. Pompey had retired to his villa Albanum, and instead of protecting or interfering in behalf of Cicero, coolly referred a delegation of the noblest men of Rome to the consuls! His friendship was hypocrisy, and his proposal a mockery. Cicero in his extremity actually cast himself "at Pompey's feet, who did not even ask him to rise, but told him as he lay there that he could do nothing against the will of Cæsar." By the advice of some of his friends he determined to go into voluntary exile, although he afterwards regretted that he had not fought the matter out in the streets of Rome. Cæsar was just outside the walls of Rome, and Clodius assembled the tribes in the Circus Flaminius, that he might attend. In reply to Clodius, he repeated his assertion, that the condemnation of the associates of Catiline was illegal, but advised the people to cast the mantle of oblivion over the past. The very day, however, that Cicero left the city, a bill, untechnical and ungrammatical, interdicted him by name from fire and water. The clause, forbidding any one upon pain of death, to entertain him within four hundred miles of Rome, was utterly disregarded. His last act, before his departure, was to place in the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus a statue of Minerva, an intimation that they needed her wisdom now that his counsel was absent. His friends in tears followed him without the city, and he hoped soon to be recalled. His property was at once confiscated, his house on the Palatine was burnt down before night, and his wife was obliged to take refuge among the Vestal virgins. His villas at Tusculum and Formiæ were subsequently laid waste. After some weeks he reached Brundusium, crossed over into Epirus, and went to Thessalonica, where he spent seven months. His

letters during this period show great weakness and the utmost prostration of mind. They are filled with peevish complaints, and find fault with his best friends who were doing all they could to obtain his recall. His grief was utterly abject, and we could almost wish that the letters that show us his great weakness and utter inability to support misfortune had not been preserved. Terentia, whom he calls "the most faithful and best of wives," displayed much more courage, and did her best to console him; while Atticus showed every quality of true friendship by assisting his almost penniless family, and devoting himself to his interests.

Clodius now ruled Rome by means of the mob. Cæsar was absent from Rome, and Pompey and Crassus could do nothing. Clodius opposed even the measures of Cæsar, and threatened the life of Pompey, so that in self-defence he turned against the worthless demagogue. Although both the consuls, all the tribunes save two, Pompey and Cæsar, the Senate, and all Italy, with nearly all the best citizens, favoured Cicero's return, yet for seven months—from January 1 to August 4, B. C. 57—did Clodius continue to baffle their efforts, while violence reigned in the streets of Rome. Upon the 4th of August, in the Campus Martius, the highest nobles distributing tickets to the immense crowd that assembled, the people recalled Cicero almost by acclamation. On that very day, anticipating his recall, he left Dyrrachium, where he had been for some time, and landed at Brundusium upon the next day, where his daughter Tullia, now a widow, eagerly awaited him, and where the people received him with shouts of joy. The news of his recall soon reached him, and he set out for Rome; but such was his reception *en route* that it took him twenty-four days to reach the city. His return was like a triumph, and his journey a continued ovation. He passed through the chief cities, and from every town and village came forth the magistrates to welcome him, while the peasants left their labours in the fields, and brought their families to see him as he passed. As he drew near to Rome by the Via Appia, the Senate, and, as it seemed, all Rome, met him outside the walls. He entered the city in a gilded chariot, and proceeded along the Sacra Via, through the Forum to the Capitol, amid the

acclamations of the immense multitude, who again hailed him as the Saviour of the Republic, the Father of his country. It was like the return of Demosthenes to Athens, and that glorious procession from the Peiræus to the Acropolis. Cicero says that that one day was equivalent to immortality (*immortalitatis instar fuit*). The next day he addressed the Senate in a most florid speech of thanks, but bitterly attacking the Consuls of the preceding year. Upon the same day he delivered the oration *Ad Quirites*, in the Forum, and the people were again delighted with that voice which had not saluted their ears for nearly eighteen months.

Clodius now stirred up a "Bread riot," and Cicero secured the passage of a law giving to Pompey, for five years, the control of the import of grain, and the price of provisions soon fell. Clodius constantly crossed his path, and at the head of his band of cut-throats, attempted to kill him. It was with difficulty that Cicero obtained some compensation for the destruction of his property, and the restoration of the site of his house on the Palatine Hill, on a portion of which Clodius had erected a temple, and dedicated it to Liberty. He commenced rebuilding his house, but Clodius and his band drove away the workmen; and upon one occasion Cicero, who was obliged to have armed attendants, barely escaped with his life. Paris, during the reign of terror, was not the scene of greater violence than were the streets of Rome at this period; and even Cicero, in his letters, intimates that his party would employ military force to defeat certain bills. Sick of politics, however, he resumed his favourite duties as an advocate, and delivered a number of speeches both in the Forum and in the Senate. His letters show a more favourable opinion of Cæsar, while still adhering to Pompey.

It was at this time that he delivered his admirable speech, *De Provinciis Consularibus*, in which he pronounced Cæsar to be the greatest military genius—save, perhaps, Hannibal—that the world had ever seen, and uttered a magnificent eulogy upon his victorious career. Literature now began to engross more and more of Cicero's attention, and his literary career may be said to have begun in the fifty-second year of his age, when he composed his treatise, *De Oratore*—the same year in

which he delivered the severest of all his speeches, that *In Pisonem*, in which he employs language such as no public body would now tolerate. His popularity as an advocate was now so great that he could scarcely leave Rome, even in the hottest and most unhealthy season of the year. It is sad, however, to see him defending some of the very worst men of Rome, whom he thoroughly detested, simply to please Cæsar and Pompey, and to retain their support. His own political influence had now become a shadow, and he was compelled to seek protection from others at the expense of political consistency, and sometimes, as his letters reveal, with compunctions of conscience. An extract from one of his letters to his brother Quintus, who was one of Cæsar's lieutenants in Gaul, will show how he felt in reference to public affairs and his own position:—"I withdraw myself altogether from politics, and devote myself to literature; but I will confess to you what I had especially wished to conceal from you. I am distracted, my dearest brother—I am distracted to think that we have no longer a Republic, or courts of justice; and that this period of my life, when I ought to have been in a flourishing position, and in the full enjoyment of a Senator's authority, is either tormented by the labours of the Forum, or soothed only by literature at home—to think that all in vain have I followed the advice in my favourite line of Homer—

Αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων,—

that my enemies have partly been not opposed, and partly defended by me,—that my inclinations are not free, and I am not even allowed to hate as I like; and that Cæsar has proved to be the only one who loved me as I wished to be loved; or the only one (as others think) who really wished to love me."* Cæsar cultivated his friendship and wrote him frequently. Cicero could not help admiring the greatness of his talents, and being won by the amiability and magnanimity of his character, although still personally attached to Pompey and generally coinciding in his political views. His celebrated letter to Lentulus, the pro-consul of Cilicia, has been styled his "Apology for his political conduct," and shows the motives that influenced him in his change of views and actions in reference to Cæsar, Pom-

* Ep. ad Q. fratriem, iii. 5, 6.

pey, and Crassus, the members of the first Triumvirate. But to this subject we can merely allude. Cæsar never lost an opportunity to win Cicero to his side, and employed him to assist Oppius in superintending the magnificent improvements of the Forum, which he carried on even while absent in Gaul. Cicero foresaw the storm that was now approaching, and looked to Cæsar for refuge. The murder of Clodius, by the slaves of Milo, is but an evidence of the anarchical condition of Rome, which led to the appointment of Pompey as sole consul. Cicero failed utterly in his defence of Milo, and he was banished. Cicero afterwards wrote his admirable speech, *pro Milone*, in reference to which Milo, in bitter irony, remarked, "It is fortunate for me that this is not the speech that was delivered at my trial: for in that case I should not have been eating such capital things as these Marseilles mullets."

Besides his efforts at the bar he was diligently engaged in the education of his son and nephew, and in literary pursuits. It was at this period that he composed his *De Republica* and *De Legibus*. Crassus had been defeated and slain by the Parthians, and only Pompey and Cæsar remained to contend for the supremacy of Rome. Cicero had become an Augur, an office which he had long desired, and was obliged, much against his will, to become pro-consul of Cilicia. Here he was as mild, popular, and successful as in his earlier government of Sicily. His conduct was in striking contrast with that of those who usually governed the provinces in the name of Rome. His administration was not, however, altogether spotless, and he must be admitted to have sacrificed justice to friendship in deciding the claims of Brutus against the people of Salamis in Cyprus and Ariobarzanes, a king of Cappadocia. His conduct here is indefensible; but we must in justice say that no other blot upon his public career can be discovered. He gained considerable military success over some of the mountain tribes in his province, for which he solicited and eventually obtained from the Senate a *supplicatio*, with the hope of a triumph upon his return to Rome. On his journey he heard with unaffected sorrow of the death of his great rival, Hortensius; and upon his return to Italy found all things ripe for a civil war between Pompey and Cæsar.

A change in the constitution of Rome had now become a necessity, the only question was as to the mode of its accomplishment, and each of the great leaders was anxious that it should accrue to his benefit. Cæsar possessed so much confidence in his own abilities and his influence with the people, that he remained absent from Rome for ten years, while Pompey seemed to control affairs, and at length became dictator in all save the name. Cicero met Pompey whom he found not averse to war and confident of his ability to crush Cæsar, for whom he professed great contempt. Cicero advised that Cæsar should be allowed to stand for the consulship while retaining his military command. This was not conceded; nor was Cæsar's proposal that he and Pompey should both lay down their commands. The Senate with Pompey prepared for war, and Cicero, although heavily in debt to Cæsar, sided with them. Cæsar was outlawed, and he no longer had a choice. The die was cast; the Rubicon was passed; and in less than three months he was master of Italy and of Rome. Cicero was patriotic and disinterested in his motives in siding with Pompey. His letters at this period reveal Pompey's incompetency for the crisis, and his utter inability to cope with Cæsar; while they show that he thought their cause utterly hopeless. "We are vanquished, crushed, captured," he wrote, even before Italy was abandoned in ignominious flight. Cicero, still attended by his lictors, was dreaming of a triumph, the honour of which he could not yet decide to forego when his country was in the throes of dissolution. This personal vanity leading to indecision, was the great weakness of his character. He could not decide what course to pursue. Brought into immediate contact with his former idol, he discovered that he was neither a great statesman, nor a great general. He was flying before Cæsar, and proposed to leave his country only to cut off its supplies or to return and ravage it with fire and sword. Convinced that he was mistaken in Pompey, and that his cause was no longer that of the constitution, Cicero still clung to him from a feeling of gratitude and not of patriotism. The characters of the two leaders now stood out in strong contrast, and Cicero being judge, the decision is decidedly in favour of Cæsar. Yet the letters of Cæsar, and even a personal interview at Formiæ, could

not induce Cicero to go to Rome. He ought at least to have remained neutral. No adequate picture, however, of the state of his mind and its alternations for months, can be presented. At length, against the remonstrances of his family and many of his personal friends, he left Italy to join Pompey in Greece. Here he criticised matters so severely that his views did not meet with much favour. The keen sarcasm of which he was so consummate a master, and of which he was by no means sparing, gave great offence; and even Pompey exclaimed, "I wish Cicero would go over to Cæsar, in order to become afraid of us."

There are considerable breaks in his letters about this period. Pompey's victory at Dyrrachium was followed by his overwhelming defeat at Pharsalia, at which Cicero was not present. He soon afterwards crossed over to Brundusium, thus separating himself from Pompey's adherents. He shortly heard of the assassination of Pompey, and mourned his death as that of an "upright, pure, and earnest man," but with a warmth greatly cooled by the knowledge of Pompey's plans of confiscation and revenge had he been victorious in the great struggle. Cicero had lent large sums of money to Pompey, and he was now greatly embarrassed. His daughter Tullia was unfortunate in her second marriage, and his brother Quintus had quarrelled with him, his nephew had slandered him, and there are intimations of trouble with his wife. In addition to all these things he knew not how Cæsar would treat him, and was driven almost to despair. In September, B. C. 47, Cæsar landed in Italy, and Cicero with mingled fear and hope went to meet him, and was most graciously received. At last he went to Rome, having dismissed his lictors, and at length given up all hopes of a triumph!

The Republic was dead, and Rome was no longer free. Cicero now devoted himself chiefly to literature. He was more than sixty years of age, and yet within the next three years he composed his *Brutus*, *Partitiones Oratoriæ*, *Cato*, *Orator*, *Academica*, *de Finibus*, *Tusculanæ Disputationes*, *de Natura Deorum*, *de Divinatione*, *de Fato*, *de Amicitia*, *de Senectute*, *de Gloria*, *Topica* and *de Officiis*, besides several orations;—an amount of literary labour almost incredible.

Again private griefs overwhelmed him. For causes not now fully understood he divorced his wife Terentia, married a second wife and divorced her also. He lost his daughter Tullia, the idol of his heart, and was almost crushed by the blow. All these things occurred within a year, and he in vain sought consolation in philosophy and in literature. The dastardly assassination of Cæsar again brought Cicero into political life for a short time. He was not privy to the conspiracy although he witnessed the deed, and we regret to say, applauded it. His letters in reference to the murder produce a most unfavourable impression as to his character. Although he disliked and distrusted Antony, yet in his letters to him he professed the warmest friendship. Political motives are the only excuse for this dissimulation. He left Rome and was engaged in study and in writing a number of the works we have named above. He began a voyage to Athens to see his son, but being driven back by adverse winds he returned to Rome, where he was received by the Senate and the people with the utmost enthusiasm.

It was now that Cicero rose to the greatest height of patriotism and of courage. He had hoped that Antony might prove a patriot and save the Republic. Discovering his mistake, the course of events gradually led him into the most violent opposition to the measures of Antony, who was at that time consul. Into the particulars of this contest, which soon became a most bitter personal controversy, we cannot enter. The Antonine Orations in their fierce invective surpass even the Philippics of Demosthenes, the name of which they have assumed, and are not inferior to them in stirring eloquence or fervid patriotism. The second Philippic was never delivered, and in its terribleness is equalled only by the oration of Demosthenes against Midias. In the separation that now occurred between Antony and Octavius, the future Augustus, Cicero of course sided with the latter, although he had not much confidence in him as a leader. When Antony, however, ceased to be consul, and Caius Cæsar, as Cicero called him, was in open hostility against him, the orator pledged his honour to the Senate and people of Rome, that the young adventurer would always prove himself such a citizen as they desired him to be. In a short time and

in the moment of victory he betrayed the cause of the Senate and formed a coalition with Antony. Cicero was the very soul of the senatorial party who so strongly opposed Antony, and his firmness and courage in this contest are in marked contrast with his timidity and vacillation in the civil war between Cæsar and Pompey. Forsyth says, "he could never act boldly unless his conscience was at ease;" in the former war he was afraid he might be wrong, now he knew that he was right. "No peace with Antony!" the worst enemy of his country's liberties, was his motto. "We have repelled the arms of traitors," he exclaims; "but we must wrest them from their hands; and if we cannot do this—I will speak as becomes a Senator and a Roman—let us die!" A letter from Antony, who was besieging Decimus Brutus in Mutina, was the occasion of Cicero's thirteenth Philippic, a speech as bitter as that against Piso, and even more savage perhaps in its invective than the second Philippic. The news of Antony's defeat near Bononia by the consuls Hirtius and Pansa, with whom was joined Octavius, was received with the utmost enthusiasm by the people at Rome, who spontaneously rushed to Cicero's house, and amid the joyful shouts of the surging crowds accompanied him along the Sacra Via to the Capitol, that he might return thanks to the gods for victory. In this glorious Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, upon the next day, before the assembled Senate, he delivered his fourteenth Philippic, the last of his orations which has reached us. Too much cannot be said in praise of the power, the patriotism, and the eloquence of this series of orations by this greatest of Roman orators.

But the war was not yet ended. The Consul Pansa had fallen, and in the next battle before Mutina victory was doubtful, although Antony finally retired from the siege. But the other Consul, Hirtius, was killed, and thus Octavius was left in command. He was suspected of procuring the death of each, and Niebuhr thinks "that the suspicion was not without foundation!"

Rome was now without a leader, and it was uncertain how Octavius would act. Had Cicero been a man of nerve equal to the emergency, he might have assumed the reins, and perhaps saved his country. But nothing could change the course of

events. Antony gained over to his cause first the army of Lepidus, and then Lepidus himself. Pollio then joined him, and finally even the faithful Plancus; while Decimus Junius was some time after seized in disguise, and murdered by the command of Antony. Octavius was alienated by the refusal of the Senate to allow him to stand for the consulship long before the legal age, and his army was dissatisfied by its failure to pay their bounty and rewards. Octavius marched upon Rome, entered its gates as conqueror, and in the twenty-first year of his age was declared a Roman Consul. The destiny of the Republic was fixed, its fate was sealed; and Cicero, bitterly disappointed in the man whom he had lately so lavishly praised, retired from Rome, and with his brother prepared to go into exile.

Octavius, now legally adopted as the son of the great Julius, marched forth from Rome ostensibly against Antony and Lepidus, but in reality to consummate the treachery he had long meditated. On the 27th of November, B. C. 43, on a little island of the Rhenus, near Bononia, the second Triumvirate was formed. They divided the world among them, and each selected an illustrious victim to satiate his vengeance, and Octavius basely surrendered Cicero to the fury of Antony. His brother and his nephew were murdered in Rome. Cicero embarked at Astura, and might have escaped but for his irresolution. He landed at Circeii, but was persuaded to embark again. The sea was rough; and sick, he landed at Cajeta, (Gaëta,) and proceeded to his villa near Formiæ, saying, "Let me die in my country, which I have saved so often!" His pursuers were upon his track, and his faithful slaves forced him into a litter, and bore him along a by-path through the woods to the shore. Some one betrayed his path, and the assassins met him as he came out of the wood. Hearing their footsteps, he ordered his attendants to set down the litter, and drawing aside the curtain, he called out to one of the leaders of the band of murderers, either Herennius or Popilius Lænas, "Here, veteran! if you think it right—strike!" His steadfast look, his gray hairs and pale countenance moved even his assassins, and they hesitated. One of the leaders then stepped forward, and with three awkward blows severed his head from

his body. "Thus fell Cicero, December 7th, B. C. 43,—the noblest victim of the bloody Triumvirate. He was exactly sixty-three years, eleven months, and five days old when he died."

His head and his hands were sent to Antony in Rome, and then, in bitter mockery, they were nailed to the Rostra, the scene of the triumphs of his eloquence. It was fitting that, in after years, when perhaps the remorse of Augustus had raised Cicero's son to the Consulship, he should commit to this son the destruction of every statue and monument that bore the name of Antony. As a man, Cicero may be subject to the charges of insincerity and vanity, for his public speeches and his private letters are often inconsistent, and he was never weary of sounding his own praises. But there is no public man of Rome whose character is so free from censure, and we involuntarily confess his superiority when we resort to a *Christian standard* in our estimate of his character. His last treatise was his *De Officiis*, in which he places duty upon a much higher ground than many of the utilitarian systems of the present day. He was ever a lover of virtue, even of whatsoever was true, and honest, and just, and pure, and lovely, and of good report, so far as man can ever be, without the pale of a written revelation. Genial and witty, he was the life of the circle in which he moved, as well as the first of his country's orators, the best of her writers, the purest of her statesmen; and, with his profound convictions of duty and of the great doctrines of a Providence and a future state, he was the wisest of her philosophers. Well did a historian remark of him:—"Vivit vivetque per omnem sæculorum memoriam; ... citiusque e mundo genus hominum quam Ciceronis gloria e memoriâ hominum unquam cedet."*

* Vell. Paterc. ii. 66.

ART. V.—*Social Life of the Chinese; with some Account of their Religious, Governmental, Educational, and Business Customs and Opinions.* By Rev. JUSTUS DOOLITTLE, for ten years a Member of the Fuhchau Mission of the American Board.

Missionary Life in Persia; being Glimpses at a Quarter of a Century of Labours among the Nestorian Christians. By Rev. JUSTIN PERKINS, D. D.

The Land and the Book; or, Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and Scenery of the Holy Land. By WILLIAM M. THOMSON, D. D., for twenty-five years a Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in Syria and Palestine.

Zulu Land; or, Life among the Zulu Kafirs of Natal and Zulu Land, South Africa. By Rev. LEWIS GRANT, for fifteen years a Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in South Africa.

Expedition to the Zambesi. By DAVID and CHARLES LIVINGSTONE.

The Hawaiian Islands; their Progress and Condition under Missionary Labours. By RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., Foreign Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M.

IT is no part of our object to give a critical notice or examination of the several works whose titles we have inserted. They were all written by missionaries, except the last; and that records the results of long-continued and faithful missionary labour among a savage people.

In the following pages we propose to speak, not of the direct influence of Christian missions, in the civilization and social improvement of heathen tribes, or in their conversion and preparation for heaven; but rather of their indirect influence upon society and the world. Our subject is *the bearing of the foreign missionary enterprise upon the cause of science and learning generally;* and we accept the titles of the works above mentioned,—to which many others equally appropriate might be added,—as a motto in this undertaking.

Were we disposed to make the most of this subject, we might call attention, first of all, to the labours of the primitive Christian missionaries,—the apostles, and their successors for the next four hundred years,—who not only traversed the vast Roman empire, embodying at that period all the civilized portions of the earth, but who penetrated on every side the surrounding regions of darkness and barbarism, carrying with them the lights and consolations of religion, and also the lesser lights of learning and science. The staid and mystic oriental, the untutored African, the rude barbarians of northern and western Europe, including our own indomitable ancestors, were first taught the use of letters, as well as brought under the humanizing influence of Christianity, by the labours of missionaries.

We might also refer to the Nestorian missionaries of the middle ages, who penetrated the wide fields of central Asia, from the uttermost bounds of China to the Euphrates and the Caspian sea, softening the hearts of the fierce natives, and enriching their minds with the rudiments of learning and the elements of holy truth. It was through this region, that the celebrated Venetian traveller, Marco Polo, passed in his excursion to the distant East. It was the Nestorian churches chiefly, that he visited and described. And the fact that, by some, his narrative has been regarded as little better than romance, was owing more to the ignorance of the reader than to a want of competency and fidelity in the writer.

We might refer also to the Romish missionaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For whatever may be thought as to the result of their labours in a religious point of view, we are persuaded that, in a literary view, full justice has not been meted to them. The principal scene of their labours was southern and eastern Asia, with some part of Africa, Mexico, and South America; and it is not too much to say, that nearly all the accurate knowledge of these great countries which the world possessed, until the last seventy years, was derived from these men. The publications of the French missionaries alone amounted to fifty large volumes, all of which were read with avidity, not only by priests and monks, but by the ablest scholars in Europe. The ancient maps of the interior pro-

vinces of China and Cochin China, of the greater Tartary, Thibet, and Japan, were constructed almost entirely by the Papal missionaries. The earliest accounts of Congo and Abyssinia were from the same source, and served as a guide to Mr. Bruce, in his subsequent travels through those countries. The Papal missionaries in South America explored and described vast regions, which had never before been visited by any European. One of these men wrote a history of the New World, of which Dr. Robertson says: "It contains more accurate observations, and more sound science, than are to be found in any description of remote countries published in that age." Another of them left a manuscript history of St. Domingo, which was the basis of the work of Charlesvoix.

But it is not our intention to enlarge on the writings of these missionaries of a former age, or on the indebtedness of the literary world to their labours. We choose rather to call attention to the *modern* missionary enterprise,—that which commenced among Protestants near the beginning of the present century, and is still prosecuted with so much vigor and success. That there is an important connection between this great enterprise and the general cause of learning and science, so that the devotees of the latter have much to expect from the continued progress of the former, and consequently should feel a deep interest in it, is to us exceedingly obvious; and we shall endeavour so to present the subject as to make it obvious to others.

What then is the modern missionary enterprise? How much is involved in it? What is it aiming to accomplish?

Those engaged in this work have undertaken to extend the Christian religion throughout the length and breadth of the earth. They have undertaken,—in literal obedience to the command of Christ,—to "preach the gospel to every creature." In prosecuting this grand design, they are engaged, so fast as men and means can be furnished, in sending forth missionaries into all lands,—to the east and the west, the north and the south,—to countries civilized and uncivilized, near and remote,—to regions long inhabited, and to the newly discovered islands of the sea. The whole earth is to be visited and

explored, and the blessings of civilization and the gospel are to be extended to all people.

And who are the men employed in this mighty enterprise? Not the ignorant and inefficient,—dunces who could do nothing at home, and from whom enlightened Christian society is quite willing to relieve itself. The men sent out as missionaries are, in the first place, *educated* men,—men who, with few exceptions, have been liberally, thoroughly educated,—men who have enjoyed the best advantages which the universities and seminaries of Christendom can boast.

Then they are, in general, men of peculiar and distinguished *talents*,—men capable of looking closely at subjects presented—of directing, to a great extent, their own studies and movements,—of pursuing successfully the most arduous literary as well as spiritual labours; of grappling effectually with whatever difficulties or opposition may be thrown in their way. It would be vain, on such an errand, to send forth other men than these; and such, in general, are the men whom the directors of modern missions have sought out, and actually sent out, into the service. If any doubt this, let them run their eye over the catalogue of missionaries who have gone forth from the different churches of England and America, during the last seventy years. There he may read the honoured names of Buchanan, and Martyn, and Morrison, and Milne, and Carey, and Marshman, and Ward, and Hall, and Abeel, and Judson, and Poor, and Eli Smith, and Miron Winslow, among the departed. He may read also the no less honoured names of King, and Hamlin, and Duff, and Goodell, and Perkins, and Thurston, and Scudder, and Byington, and Livingston, among the living. We might mention a great many others, of perhaps equal ability, —*turmæ nobilissimæ juvenum*,—who have more recently gone to their several fields of labour. Among these are to be found not only clergymen, but physicians, printers, artisans, agriculturists, and others from the different walks of life. They are, in the general, men who had the best prospects before them in their native lands, and who, by their talents and learning, their intellectual ability and moral worth, are capable of making their influence felt, and themselves respected, anywhere.

And these men are sent forth into different parts of the

earth, it must be borne in mind, not as tourists, or envoys, or diplomatists, or speculatists, to hurry over a country or continent, note first impressions, and come home and make a readable, popular book; but they are sent each to his particular station, which is henceforward to be his home. He is to remain there —to spend his life there. He is to associate familiarly with the people; study their dispositions and character; acquaint himself with their peculiar customs and manners; learn their language; read their books, if they have any; traverse their country, so far as he shall have occasion; search into their antiquities, mythology, and history; and, while he is endeavouring to do them good, is to make himself acquainted (as manifestly he ought to) with everything of interest respecting them. And now we ask, is it possible that men thus situated, and of the character above described, should not make numerous and important discoveries in the different departments of science and learning? Is it possible that they should not have it in their power—being in constant communication with their patrons at home—to make continual and large accessions to that general fund of knowledge, which belongs appropriately to the world?

One of the most important branches of human learning is *philology*. Ever since the confusion of tongues at Babel, and the consequent separation of the tribes of men, a necessity has been imposed upon those who would become learned, or who would associate extensively with mankind, to acquire different languages. And the study of languages has constituted no small part of the mental labour of our race. This being the case, every new fact which is discovered in the history of language—every new principle which is unfolded and established —every additional facility in this branch of study—in short, every accession which is made to the general stock of linguistic lore—should be regarded as so much gained to the cause of learning, and to the interests and happiness of man. And who, we ask, are in more favourable circumstances for promoting these important objects, than missionaries? And who have done more for their actual advancement?

When a missionary plants himself among a people, his first effort is to acquire their language. And this he must do, not

superficially, but thoroughly, so that he may be able not only to read their books, if they have any, but to converse with them freely, and address them intelligibly. If their language is an unwritten one, like that of most savage tribes, he first forms a list of words, as caught by the ear; reduces them to order and rule; establishes his system of orthography; constructs his lexicon and grammar; and by the time he is able to converse familiarly with the people, he has prepared for them, and for the world, a written language.

The work performed, in this case, by the missionary, is not only an acquisition to himself, and to those for whose special benefit it was intended, but it is, we repeat, an acquisition to the world. It is so much gained to the great republic of letters. And how often has this work been accomplished, and this gain been realized, within the last seventy years, through the instrumentality of Christian missionaries? We may go even further and ask, when, where, has this work been accomplished at all in modern times, except through their instrumentality? Commerce has not done it. Neither literary interest, nor governmental influence has ever done it. But Christian missionaries have done it, we had almost said a hundred times over. And are these devoted men entitled to no credit, on this behalf, from the learned world? Did Cadmus immortalize his name, by introducing letters into Greece, and instructing the rude natives in their use? And shall no honour be given, and no obligation be felt, to those in our own age, who have done the same thing, and done it on a far wider scale, than was ever before attempted? Who have taught various heathen tribes, in the west and south of Africa, in different parts of Asia, in our own forests, and in the islands of the sea, the use of letters, and are now engaged in preparing books, and creating for them a literature of their own?

The incidental advantages of a labour such as this to the cause of learning, are scarcely less important than its direct results. In the work of shaping an unformed language, studying it in its elements, and committing it to writing, new and important facts will be likely to be discovered, and principles before unknown may be educed. And not only so, affinities in language may be traced, and the origin of nations thereby dis-

covered, which otherwise had been concealed. It was in this way that the track of our own English ancestors was traced, at the distance of three or four thousand years, to the neighbourhood of the Caucasian mountains and the Black and Caspian seas.

The question is often asked, Whence came the aborigines of America to this country? And whence the numerous and populous tribes inhabiting the green isles of the western ocean? The time for a full and satisfactory answer to these questions has, probably, not yet come. But we predict that, whenever they are answered, the result will be owing, in no small degree, to the discoveries of missionaries, in tracing out affinities in language, and comparing the customs and features, the domestic habits and religious rites of different nations.

But the missionary, in many instances, is not under the necessity of shaping a language for his people. He finds one written to his hand; it may be a venerable language, like the Arabic, the Sanscrit, and Chinese. In this case, as before, his first labour is to acquire the language—to acquire it thoroughly—that he may be able not only to use it in common conversation, but to consult libraries, read books, and possess himself of whatever learning may be treasured in it. This many Christian missionaries have already done; and having done it, they obviously possess the means, beyond almost any others, of promoting the literary interests of the world. Take, for example, the missionaries in Syria, who have made themselves familiar with the Arabic tongue. This language is remarkable, not only for its great age, for the beauty and finish of its structure, and for the wide extent to which it is spoken, but for the literary treasures which are supposed to be hoarded and buried under it. It is a singular fact that, in the ninth and tenth centuries of the Christian era—the very midnight of the dark ages—when the lights of learning and science seemed, in all other countries, ready to expire, they blazed up, with a steady and glowing refulgence, in Arabia and the surrounding countries. Under the patronage of the Caliphs, learned men were drawn together, extensive libraries were collected, schools were established, the best works of the Greeks were translated into the Arabic tongue, and no means were neglected, and no expense spared, which would be

likely to conduce to the advancement of learning. The consequence was, that the literati and philosophers of Arabia became, in a short time, the most celebrated in the world. For a long period they were the chief depositaries of learning, and subsequently became the instructors of Europe. Some of the Arabic works prepared at that period have been translated, more have been destroyed, but others, it is with good reason believed, remain concealed. They are treasured up in palaces and castles, in public and private libraries, in different Mohammedan countries, and need but the search of qualified Arabic scholars to bring them again before the world. And who so likely to make this search—to make it diligently and effectually—as missionaries residing in those countries; men who are acquainted with the manners and customs of the people, possess their confidence, and are able to read their language with the same facility as their own? We may be enthusiastic on this point, but we cannot resist the impression that scholars and antiquaries have yet much to hope from the inquiries of missionaries—inquiries made without at all interfering with the appropriate duties of these men—in search of hidden, buried remains of Arabic learning.

The dependence of letters on the missionary work may be strongly illustrated, by considering what has been done in reference to China. Only a few years ago, the celestial empire—embodying more than a third of the population of the globe—was to the rest of the world little better than a *terra incognita*, enclosed, as it was, by the double wall of commercial restrictions, and its invincible, unreadable language. Both these walls have been, in great measure, broken down and taken out of the way; the latter of them chiefly by the labours of missionaries. In the year 1807, the celebrated Morrison entered on his mission to China. After a residence of four years, he completed a grammar of the language. In eleven years more, he had prepared and printed, at an expense of £12,000, a complete Chinese and English Dictionary, in six quarto volumes. Meanwhile, Dr. Marshman, at Serampore, was labouring in the same cause, where he published his ponderous *Clavis Sinica*, and translated, we believe, the entire works of Confucius. By these and the subsequent labours of mission-

aries, the barrier-door, excluding all intercourse between the celestial empire and those who speak the English language, has been fairly thrown open. The Chinese is now made as accessible, and almost as easy of acquisition, as any other language. Americans visiting that country may soon be able to converse with the Chinaman in his own tongue, and he with them in theirs.

Of the importance of a literary achievement, like that of Morrison above described, we are scarcely able to conceive. When we think of the extent of the Chinese empire, of the swarming millions of its population, of the commercial interests connected with it, and of the value of an unrestricted social intercourse between it and Protestant Christian nations; the work to which we have referred, considered only in a literary point of view, swells to an importance of which we know not how worthily to speak. Compared with it, of how little value are the light, ephemeral effusions of our tale tellers and fiction-mongers, who would fain be regarded as *par excellence* the literati of England and America!

We have spoken of the labour bestowed upon the language of China, because of the vast interests to be affected by it, and not because the work itself is greater than that performed in other places. Indeed, it is by no means so great. The English and American missionaries have prepared dictionaries, vocabularies, and grammars of many heathen languages. Dr. Judson prepared and published, many years ago, a valuable lexicon of the Burmese. Mr. Andrews, a missionary to the Sandwich Islands, has prepared a dictionary of the Hawaiian tongue, containing and defining more than 15,000 words. One of the last works of the late Dr. Winslow was an elaborate Tamil and English dictionary. Dr. Carey, the pioneer of modern missions, published grammars of no less than eight languages, and a dictionary of one.

Nor should we omit to mention, in this connection, the many translations which have been made, during the last fifty years, of the Holy Scriptures. Dr. Judson gave to the Burmese a very valuable translation of the whole Bible. The late Dr. Bridgman, with some assistance from others, translated the entire Scriptures into the written language of China. Doctors

Smith and Van Dyck have brought out a new and very perfect translation of the Arabic Bible; and Dr. Goodell has lived to complete his translation of the Scriptures into the Armeno-Turkish. In the establishment at Serampore, many years ago, the Holy Scriptures were in the process of translation and publication in from twenty to thirty languages, at the same time.

Some persons will think lightly of undertakings such as these because they pertain so exclusively to the Bible. But has the Bible, we ask, no literary merit? Setting it aside (if it must be so) as a book of religion, is it not itself a literary production; and one that will more than bear a comparison—in point of excellence as well as antiquity—with the best of Greece and Rome? Does it not contain history, and poetry, and eloquence—eloquence without the fires of ambition or party; poetry, without the alloy of a cumbrous and debasing mythology; history, without the ornaments and falsehoods of national partiality? And is it of no importance, in a literary view, to give this volume to the nations? Who can estimate the literary influence and importance of Luther's Bible in Germany, or of our own invaluable translation of the Scriptures in England and America? But what these translations have done for us, the translations which have been made and given to the heathen will, in due time, effect for them.

That we may not be thought to stand alone in our estimate of the literary labours of missionaries in the East, we may refer to the editors of the *London Quarterly Review*. In the first nineteen volumes of this great critical work—we have not had time to look through the volumes further—there are no less than fourteen extended articles on missionary publications. The reviewers speak of the missionaries in the East as "learned and indefatigable scholars," whose "progress in the oriental languages is wonderful," and to whom "the European world is indebted, in no small degree, for the extension of its knowledge of oriental literature." "The *Clavis Sinica* of Dr. Marshman, and the Dictionary of Dr. Morrison," they say, "are the two most acceptable works that the study of Asiatic literature has yet produced. They have completely torn away the veil that so long enveloped the symbolic writing of the Chinese, and removed the difficulty that has hitherto impeded the study of

that singular language." In short, the reviewers represent these missionaries as having "a claim to the thanks of the literary part of the world," and as being "the benefactors of the human race."

But the labours of missionaries are not to be estimated alone by their success in mastering difficult languages. At all the principal stations the press is in operation, furnishing a new and purified literature to the people immediately concerned, and bringing out whatever of interest may have been concealed among them, for the benefit of the world.

Nor is this all. At most of the principal stations there are established not only schools, but *high-schools*, *colleges*, *seminaries of learning*, designed to furnish to the more promising youth the advantages of a liberal and professional education. Such a college was founded by Dr. Morrison at Malacca. Several of a like character have been established in Bengal. Others are founded in Burmah, Ceylon, Constantinople, on the West Coast of Africa, and in the Sandwich and Society Islands. These all are the results of missionary labour, and nearly all are superintended by missionaries themselves. Of their present and prospective literary importance we need not speak. Calculate, if you can, the importance, in a literary view, of almost any of the colleges of our country. But what these colleges have been, and are, to the youth of America, the colleges established by missionaries in heathen lands will be to the teeming myriads who surround them. These institutions, though yet in their infancy, have begun to scatter wide their blessings; and they will continue to scatter them, with a broader cast and a more liberal hand, till science, learning, and religion shall have completed their joint conquest over the darkness and superstitions of men.

But the missionary enterprise has other connections with learning and science, aside from those which have been noticed. The geography and history of foreign countries, their natural scenery and curiosities, their geology and botany, the manners and customs of the inhabitants, their superstitions and their religious rites,—all these constitute subjects of inquiry in which the learned world have a deep interest, and who, we ask, are more favourably situated to pursue such inquiries, and bring

them to a successful issue, than foreign missionaries? And who, we ask further, have accomplished more than they, in these several departments of knowledge, during the last fifty years? Take, for example, the single subject of geography. Into what parts of the earth have these heroic men not gone? What island so remote that they have not visited? What mountain so lofty that they have not climbed? Going everywhere, they bring back knowledge of distant regions. The most intrepid of explorers, they are at the same time the most faithful narrators. "They have rendered," says one, "more real service to the science of *geography*—to the accurate knowledge of our globe, than all the geographical societies in the world."

The period, however, has not yet come, when the discoveries of missionaries, on all the points above referred to, can be noted in long detail. They have not had sufficient time and opportunity to accomplish more than a small part of what may yet be expected of them. Still, enough has been done, in correcting mistakes and misapprehensions which once prevailed, and giving accuracy to our knowledge on many points, to entitle them to grateful consideration. Let us pause and notice a few of the instances in which gross mistakes of one kind or another have been corrected.

In former times, when the uncivilized portions of the earth were less known than at present, it was not uncommon for navigators and travellers to return from their excursions with the most extravagant accounts of their discoveries. Nothing was too absurd or ridiculous to find a place in their veracious narratives. They seemed to vie one with another in their effort at the marvellous, and he was sure to be the most successful author, who succeeded in telling the toughest story. For example, an ancient traveller returning from the East,* affirmed that "the Bramins of India keep tubs full of rain, wind, and thunder, constantly by them, which they bestow upon their friends, or inflict upon their enemies, according to their pleasure;"—that "the earth swells and rolls, like the waves of

* Apollonius of Tyana, whom some modern infidels have held up as the rival and compeer of our Saviour. See his Life, written by Philostratus, an Athenian.

the sea, only at the touch of a Bramin's wand"—that at the feasts of the Bramins, "there is no need of servants, since the chairs, stools, pots, cups, dishes and plates, understand every one its own office, and move spontaneously hither and thither, as the case requires." He asserts, that in one country, he found the women particoloured, half black and half white; in another, a nation of pigmies living under ground; in another, apes as large as men, and a kind of beasts having faces like men and bodies like lions. In another country which he visited, he found wool growing out of the ground like grass, and dragons as plenty as sheep in Arcadia. Even Herodotus tells of a country in farther India, where the ants are larger than foxes, and throw up monstrous ant-heaps of sand, from which the gold-hunters extract their gold.*

At a much later period, the discoverers of the Nicobar Islands pretended that they had found a spring, which had the property of turning iron into gold; also that the natives of those islands were furnished with a suffix, such as Lord Monboddo supposed belonged originally to our whole race, but which the inhabitants of civilized countries, by too much sitting, had worn off. This latter story, no less a man than Linnæus was inclined to believe.

At a still later period, the Spaniards who discovered Florida alleged that they had found a spring, which instantly restored the aged and infirm, who bathed in its waters, to all the verdure and vigour of youth.

It was to ridicule and restrain this propensity for the marvellous, which induced Swift to entertain his readers with his celebrated Gulliverian tales—an object which he, to some extent, accomplished. His stories had about the same potency to check one evil, which the romance of Don Quixotte had to remove another. Both, for the time, were pretty well laughed out of countenance.

Still, neither the extravagance of explorers, nor the credulity of readers, was entirely cured at once. Enough of the evil yet remained to furnish abundant work of correction to the faithful missionary. For example, it was formerly denied in England that widows in India ever burned themselves on the

* Book iii. Sect. 102.

funeral piles of their deceased husbands. But owing to the researches of missionaries, almost every child in Christendom is now acquainted with the dreadful fact.

The accounts given by navigators who first visited the Pacific Islands, as to the character and condition of the natives, are well remembered. These natives were represented as the very children of nature,—unsuspecting, uncontaminated, free, amiable, devoid of care, and living together in an almost paradisaical state of innocence and happiness. Their females, like the sea-nymphs of ancient fable, came floating around the anchored vessel, as willing to attract the notice of the strangers, as to gratify their own reasonable curiosity. The glowing accounts which had been published as to the character and condition of these islanders constituted an inducement, perhaps, with the directors of the London Missionary Society, to make them the first objects of their benevolent regards. Accordingly, the missionaries went and settled among them, and entered upon the work of their civilization and conversion. And they soon found what kind of characters they had to deal with, and how much the credulity of the public had been abused. They found as unequivocal marks of Adamic descent in these uncontaminated children of nature, as could be found in any other portion of the world. They were treacherous, warlike, bloody, licentious, man-killers and man-eaters, murderers of fathers and mothers, and even of their own children. They were besotted in ignorance, averse to every kind of useful exertion, the slaves alike of their chiefs, their idolatries, and their lusts. Such was the state in which these happy islanders were actually found, and in this state they continued, until the light of Christianity began to dawn upon their minds, and its sanctifying power was felt upon their hearts.

The misapprehensions which formerly prevailed in regard to the extent and value of *oriental learning* were both gross and hurtful. Sir William Jones and his coadjutors contributed something towards correcting these evils, but much more has been effected by the researches of missionaries. Of the justness of this remark we might give many proofs, but our limits confine us to two or three.

The most extravagant notions were entertained formerly, by

learned men, respecting the wisdom of the Hindoo Bramins, exhaustless stores of which were supposed to be treasured up in the Vedas—their sacred books. It was presumed by infidels of the last age, that when these came to be translated and opened, they would far surpass the Christian Scriptures, and bring them into utter contempt. The Vedas have not, indeed, been translated, for they have been found to be not worth translating; but by the indefatigable Ward and other missionaries, they have been opened and read, and the public have been fully apprized of their contents; and the age of wonder, conjecture, and admiration in regard to them has passed quite away. With the exception of the Rig Veda—the oldest book—they are found to be chiefly remarkable for their contradictions, exaggerations, indelicacies, puerilities, and for the nurture which they continually administer to some of the worst passions of the human heart.

A similar work to that here detailed has been performed in reference to the Chinese lawgiver. He had long been exhibited as a prodigy of wisdom, almost justifying the superstition of his followers in ascribing to him divine honours. But unfortunately for his reputation, the great Confucius has been translated. He has been raised by the learned Marshman from his long burial in the darkness of an unknown tongue, and brought out before the world. And now he appears a very indifferent personage. He has become weak like another man.

We all know what has been the fate of the fabulous chronological legends of China, when subjected to the scrutiny of some of the eastern missionaries. It used to be said, and by many believed, that the Chinese had unquestionable historical records, which carried back their origin to thousands and perhaps millions of years previous to the Mosaic account of the creation. The taunts and scoffs, the boastings and exultations of infidel writers and talkers on this subject were loud, and confident, and long. But with all persons of common information they have come to an end now. The Chinese have no reliable history anterior to the time of Confucius, who was contemporary with Ezra and Nehemiah; nor, after every allowance which can reasonably be made, can they claim for their nation a higher antiquity than the age of Abraham.

We may refer to an instance of correction by a missionary, of a more recent date. Some years ago an infidel philosopher went to New Holland for the purpose of examining the character of the natives, and ascertaining whether they were men or brutes. He collected and criticised a vast number of skulls, and at length came to the conclusion, and published it, that the natives were not human beings, but a species of apes. Shortly after, a Methodist missionary invited the philosopher to go with him, and visit a converted native on his death-bed. They went together, and heard the native confess his sins, express his hope in Christ, quote Scripture, and speak in general of his religious experience. At the close of the interview, the missionary turned to the philosopher and said: "Sir, did you ever see a monkey die after this manner?" The confounded philosopher could only reply, "My philosophy stands corrected by your Christianity."

Of the work of correction by a missionary, we had an example in this country not many years ago. An English gentleman, professing to have been a great traveller, visited many of our cities, delivering lectures on the Holy Land. Wishing to make his performance lucrative and popular, if he wanted a good story to give interest to it, he had no difficulty in finding one. If he needed some touching fact or thrilling incident "to point his moral, or adorn his tale," it was always at hand. He had seen a lion come up from the swellings of Jordan. He had seen the rocks of Palestine all swarming with bees, rendering it still a land of honey, if not of milk. But happily there was a missionary on the romancer's track—one who had long resided in the country described, and was perfectly acquainted with its localities and condition. He was able to set the matter right, and disabuse the public of the impositions which had been practised.

We need refer to no more instances of corrections and rectifications. Those we have noticed are sufficient to show that the learned world are under *some* obligations, on this account, to the studies and labours of faithful missionaries. Next to the importance of knowing anything, is that of possessing accurate knowledge. And he who assists to correct our mistakes, and

give us accuracy of knowledge, confers upon us an important benefit.

We have spoken already of *geographical* knowledge, as imparted by missionaries. But this is not all. Not only have unvisited regions of the earth's surface been explored, but the customs and manner of life pursued by the natives have been searched out. Their gods and demons, their idolatries, superstitions, and religious rites, have been investigated and exposed. At the different missionary houses in London and Boston, there are whole rooms full of heathen gods,—sufficient in number to load a vessel,—figures the most grotesque, hideous, terrific, odious,—like nothing "in heaven above, or the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth;" spoils won by the bloodless conflicts of missionaries from heathen temples, and transmitted home as trophies of their victory.

The journals of missionaries in new and unexplored regions are full of important information, and are worthy of perusal and preservation, not only by Christians, but by the devotees of science and learning. Here are described the peculiar features of different countries; their cities and villages, their soils, rocks, mountains, rivers, animals, vegetables, and natural curiosities; and specimens in great numbers have been furnished to grace the cabinets of the learned at home. One of the greatest geological wonders of the world has been discovered, within a few years, by missionaries at the Sandwich Islands. We refer to the dread volcano of Kilanea, with a crater of not less than eight miles in circumference, and fifteen hundred feet in depth; a volcano compared with which Vesuvius and Ætna, with all their classic interest and fabled wonders of Cyclops, and thunderbolts, and giants, are little more than a blacksmith's forge. No wonder the nations regarded this horrid crater as the very entrance to the infernal regions.

Another important work which missionaries have aided in accomplishing, is the fixing of the localities of ancient cities and towns. It is known to every scholar that the names of hundreds of places mentioned in ancient sacred and profane history are not found on our best maps; or, if found, their localities have been fixed by mere conjecture. But the missionaries, by residing and travelling in those ancient countries—Greece,

Syria, Asia Minor, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Egypt, &c., —by observing and comparing different localities; by becoming familiar with the traditions and languages of the natives, are making new discoveries every year, and contributing to settle what before was merely conjecture or wholly unknown. The great services of the late Dr. Robinson, in settling questions of this nature in the Holy Land, are universally acknowledged. But Dr. Robinson could never have accomplished his researches, as himself admits, but by the help of a missionary. The late Dr. Eli Smith was almost constantly with him as an interpreter and guide, and assisted in drawing up many of the sketches in his journal.

In short, were the inquiry instituted, Who, in modern times, have brought into notice, and laid fairly open,—in their geography, their natural history, their social and religious state,—so many countries before almost, if not altogether, unknown,—such as Greenland, Iceland, large portions of Africa with the contiguous islands, Burmah, Siam, and eastern Asia, the Indian Archipelago, Polynesia, and many parts of our vast continent,—the answer to this inquiry is obvious and necessary. Commerce has not done it. It never would do it. Commerce is too selfish to engage extensively in enterprises of this nature. Literary interest and curiosity have not done it. At least they have accomplished but little. If we except the efforts,—very laudable ones certainly,—of the London Geographical Society to explore the interior of Africa, mere literary interest has effected almost nothing. The important work to which we refer has been performed almost exclusively by Christian missionaries. It is a result, though but an incidental one, of their sacrifices, their conflicts, and their toils; and the debt of gratitude which it imposes is due, in great measure, to them.

In the foregoing remarks, we have endeavoured to show that, —from the character of missionaries, as learned, gifted men,—from their situation, as permanent residents in foreign lands, having a familiar acquaintance with languages, localities, and other circumstances,—and from the nature of their pursuits, being scholars, teachers, travellers, authors, as well as preachers of the gospel,—it might be justly anticipated that they would

be able to do much for the cause of science and learning, as well as for the promotion of their more immediate objects. The learned would have much to expect of them. The connections between their great enterprise and the interests of learning are sufficiently numerous and obvious to justify such expectations. We have shown, too, as fully as possible within our limits, that the expectations which might reasonably be indulged have thus far been realized. In a great variety of ways, missionaries have devoted themselves to the cause of science, and have done for its advancement all that could be expected of them.

It must be borne in mind, however, as before remarked, that the missionary enterprise,—at least, the *Protestant* missionary enterprise,—has but just commenced. The great object aimed at is but in the infancy of its accomplishment, and the incidental advantages to be anticipated are but just beginning to be realized. And if,—under all the disadvantages of a new and untried undertaking, when the number of missionaries is comparatively few, and the most of them have been at their stations but a little while,—so much as we have seen has been already done, what great results are to be expected in the progress and consummation of this holy work? When the unevangelized portions of the earth shall have been explored and fully occupied by Christian missionaries,—when, fired by a quenchless and apostolic zeal, they shall have penetrated and permeated the heart of Africa, the central and northern regions of Asia, the wilds of America, the deserts of New Holland, and all the islands of the sea,—when they shall have scaled the walls of China and Japan, and planted the standard of the cross in every place on which the light of heaven shines, —when missionaries shall have been longer at their posts, and shall have become more thoroughly acquainted with the languages, the literature, the localities and circumstances of the different nations,—when their schools, their presses, their colleges, their seminaries shall have been longer in operation, and, under the influence of these, native mind, all over the earth, shall be roused into action, and learned natives, in great numbers, shall have been raised up,—in a word, when the missionary enterprise, now in its infancy, shall have had a full de-

velopment of its powers and resources, in a manly growth, and a just consummation,—what great results may assuredly be expected, not only in a religious, but a literary point of view? We may, indeed, be mistaken in the judgment we have formed in reference to this matter, but it really has seemed to us that the literature of the world has more to expect from the successful prosecution of the missionary enterprise, than from any other source whatever. We know of no other cause—we can think of no other, which is likely to produce so great results, even in a literary point of view.

In conclusion, therefore, we come boldly and earnestly to literary men, and bespeak their favour for the cause of missions. The most of our readers, we know, sympathize deeply with this cause from higher considerations than those here suggested. They love it, they value it, as philanthropists and Christians. They long to see the multiform cruelties of the dark places of the earth removed, their idolatries purged, their superstitions and their crimes for ever done away. They yearn for the debased souls of the poor heathen, and wait to see them enlightened, elevated, purified, sanctified, and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

But we address ourselves, in these concluding remarks to mere literary men, and would urge the subject on literary and scientific grounds. In view of what missionaries have already accomplished for the cause of learning, and the greater things which they may be expected to accomplish, we ask such men to dismiss their prejudices, if they have any, and to regard, henceforth, with interest and favour the mighty enterprise in which missionaries are engaged. We ask the literati of our country to follow, with their eye, the hundreds of learned, educated men, who are already abroad in different parts of the earth. Watch their movements, read their letters and journals, note their discoveries and advances in the different departments of useful learning. Listen to the accounts,—not of unprincipled libertines who sometimes wander among them, who cannot endure the strictness of their discipline, and to whose ungodly lives their holy example is a constant reproof,—but to the accounts of enlightened, virtuous, honourable men, who have themselves witnessed the results of their labours; and the more

you become acquainted with missionaries in this way, the more you will honour them. The more you know of their work in its actual progress and results, the more you will be interested in it, and the more earnestly you will desire to see it consummated.

ART. VI.—*Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ.* Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1866.
Preface Supplementary to Ecce Homo.

MOST of our readers hardly need to be told that, in the domain of religious literature, *Ecce Homo* has been, at least in Britain and America, quite the sensation book of the season, having already gone through its twelfth edition in England. It is rare that any work on Christianity has for the time commanded more general attention or elicited more general comment and criticism, friendly or adverse, in most of the accredited organs of religious opinion. This fact, rather than any novelty in its topics or special power in treating them, has laid a necessity upon us of examining its contents. We confess to some surprise at the sensation the book has made. We attribute it more to the boldness of its pretensions and the brilliancy of its rhetoric, than to any intrinsic power. We detect in the author some culture, some freshness, sparkle, and polish of style; little depth or breadth, as a thinker, an exegete, a scholar, a philosopher, or a theologian. Some of our reasons for this judgment will soon appear. The truths it contains are among the rudiments taught in Christian training and nurture, in the Sabbath-school and the nurseries. Its errors are for the most part too stale or too shallow to invest the book with any special intrinsic importance. The elementary truths concerning the person and work of Christ which it disowns or ignores, and which every Christian child knows, are far more momentous than all that it sets forth without them.

The extraordinary reception given to this book arises, we apprehend, from some extraordinary state of the public mind in Protestant Christendom. Some prevailing excitement or distemper in society will often give books an immense ephemeral popularity, that have no elements of permanent acceptance or influence. Dr. Bellamy once preached a sermon during a thunder-storm which, owing to that circumstance, produced such an impression upon the people, that they requested a copy for publication. He told them he would grant it, "if they would print the thunder and lightning with it." Many a theological or political pamphlet has exercised prodigious influence when addressed to an excited state of the public mind, which had not vitality enough to outlive that excitement. The scientific skepticism of our day, the rationalism in the church which leans towards infidelity, the timid ignorance of many real Christians, have done much towards giving this book its abnormal prominence. Some weak believers have accounted it quite an addition to their armour, offensive and defensive. They have evidently been in a state to be thankful for the smallest favours, not suspecting that they lose more than they gain by every such vindication, not of Christianity, but of something else in its name. Sceptics and destructives look with interest to see, if indeed it does build up or guard what they have been fain to destroy. Meanwhile, intelligent Christians look with amazement and alarm on the wide acceptance and popularity of a work which undertakes to commend the religion of Jesus Christ, by ignoring its most essential or distinctive elements.

There are two aspects in which such an exposition of the Life and Work of Christ may be viewed, one referring to our judgment of the intrinsic merits of the book itself—the other to the proper estimate of the author's position or tendencies. The former may be in itself very defective, erratic, even fatally heretical. The latter, in regard to his internal stand-point and religious tendencies, as manifested by such a production, must be estimated, not by this alone, but by his antecedents taken in connection with it. Two men are moving; one downward, from the heights of truth to the abyss of error, the other upward, from the slough of error to the summit of truth. They

both meet midway between the top and bottom. They are at the same point. But one is moving downward, the other upward—can there be a doubt that he who is struggling upward towards the goal of truth, is vastly nearer to it in his inner soul than he who has met him while gliding away from it? So two men may publish the same book, considerably above average Socinianism or vulgar Rationalism, but equally below the standard of scriptural doctrine and fundamental Christian truth. But the one is struggling up out of the toils of rationalistic and sceptical fallacies in which he has been trained, or long entangled. The other is falling away from the truth as it is in Jesus, to which he had formerly clung. Can there be a doubt which is the truer and sounder man, closer to Christ, and further from perdition?

Although the author still keeps his own secret, he is reputed to be a man of Socinian antecedents, struggling upward towards a higher conception of Christ and his religion than bald Unitarianism often reaches.* There is much in the whole tone and structure of the book to favour such an hypothesis. It is written as if by a man feeling that he has detected truths once unseen or unrecognized by himself, and now endeavouring to commend them to those in whose sight Christ and his gospel had borne very much the character of myths or impostures, at all events of being destitute of Divine inspiration and authority. He is apparently setting forth the transcendent excellence of Christ's character and teaching, and the proofs of superhuman power thence arising, to those who deny or overlook them. But in

* The following is going the rounds of the newspapers:

"*The Author of 'Ecce Homo.'*—The *Bookseller* for July 31st has the shrewd conjecture that the author of *Ecce Homo* is Mr. Richard Holt Hutton, one of the editors of the London *Spectator*. 'We believe,' the writer says, 'that we shall not be very far from the mark when we guess that he will probably be found in the editorial chair of a London newspaper, and that he formerly edited a review which we regret to say is now discontinued. In early life the gentleman in question was a Unitarian, closely connected with a celebrated literary family of that denomination; later in life his views became more advanced, while his faith contracted; but more recently he has attached himself to the Church of England, and will be frequently seen attending the ministry of the Rev. F. D. Maurice. If this guess prove correct, many of our readers will have no difficulty in recognizing the writer of *Ecce Homo* by the above description.'—*Presbyterian.*"

his whole procedure he seems to us to effect his purpose more by lowering Christianity to men than by lifting men up to Christianity. And in doing this, with large pretension, he gives us the thin shadow of morality for the glorious gospel of the blessed God; and besides negative errors of omission, falls into gross blunders and crudities of interpretation, by putting the fictions of his own imagination in place of the simple narratives of the evangelists.

We extract from his *Preface Supplementary*, which appears to have been issued in reply to criticisms upon the original book, the following synopsis of his main doctrine regarding Christ, as found in the Gospel by Mark, substantially repeated by Matthew and Luke, and, to some extent, by John—the only books of Scripture which the author treats as of authority, and these only partially so, in the premises.

"1. Christ assumed a position of authority, different from that assumed by ordinary teachers: Mark i. 22.

2. He claimed to be the Messiah: viii. 29, 30; xii. 6; xiv. 62.

3. Under this title he claimed an inexpressible personal rank and dignity: xii. 36, 37; xiii. 6, 7.

4. He claimed the right to revise and give a free interpretation to the Mosaic Law: ii. 27; x. 4.

5. He claimed the power of forgiving sins: ii. 10.

6. He commanded a number of men to attach themselves to his person, ii. 14; x. 21; to the society thus formed he gave special rules of life, x. 43, 44; made his name a bond of union among them, ix. 37—41; and contemplated the continuance of the society under the same conditions after his departure: xiii. 13.

7. He was believed by his followers to work miracles.

8. These miracles were principally miracles of healing.

9. The society he founded was gathered, in the first instance, from the Jews: vii. 27; but it was intended ultimately to embrace the Gentiles also: xiii. 10.

10. Though he assumed the character of King and Messiah, he declined to undertake the ordinary functions of kings: xii. 14.

11. He required from his disciples personal devotion, and

the adoption of his example as their rule of life: viii. 34, 35; x. 45.

12. He spoke of a Holy Spirit as inspiring himself; iii. 20—30; and also as inspiring his followers: xiii. 11.

13. He spoke much of the importance of having good feelings as well as good deeds: vii. 15—23; ix. 50.

14. He demanded positive and, as it were, original acts of virtue passing beyond the routine of obligation: x. 21.

15. He denounced vehemently those whose morality was of an outward, mechanical kind, and he named them hypocrites: vii. 1—13.

16. By these denunciations, and by his claims to Messiahship, he placed himself in deadly opposition to the Scribes and Pharisees: xii.

17. He required from his followers a spirit of devotion to the welfare of their fellow-creatures: ix. 35; xii. 31; and he declared himself to be actuated by the same spirit: x. 45.

18. Accordingly he went much among sick people, healing them, sometimes with strong signs of emotion: vii. 34.

19. He enjoined upon his followers a similar philanthropy: x. 21, 44—5; vi. 13.

20. He occupied himself also with curing moral disease, and particularly in the outcasts of society: ii. 16, 17.

21. He taught the forgiveness of injuries: xi. 25.

Now of these propositions, which have been deduced from St. Mark, it is to be observed, in the first place, that they are equally deducible, with scarcely the alteration of a word, from each of the other three Gospels. The only exception to this is that the author of the Fourth Gospel, who confines himself very much to generalities, does not speak definitely of the forgiveness of injuries or of the duty of relieving men's physical wants. On the other hand, he attests more strongly than the other Evangelists the prominence which was given, in Christ's moral teaching, to love. As forgiveness and philanthropy are among the most obvious manifestations of love, we may certainly say that St. John, too, though not expressly, yet implicitly, attests that they were prescribed by Christ."

Among all these, what the author counts peculiar and dis-

tinctive of Christianity, is the formation of a society by our Saviour to promote morality among men. He says,

"Let us ask ourselves what was the ultimate object of Christ's scheme. When the Divine Society was established and organized, what did he expect to accomplish? To the question, we may suppose he would have answered, the object of the Divine Society is that God's will may be done on earth as it is done in heaven. In the language of our own day, its object was the improvement of morality." *Ecce Homo*, p. 100.

So also in his *Supplementary Preface:* "Resting then upon a basis of absolutely uniform testimony, upon facts merely illustrated and explained by less certain tradition, the writer has endeavoured to describe a moralist speaking with authority and perpetuating his doctrine by means of a society. *It is this union of morals and politics that he finds to be characteristic of Christianity.*"

It is not then that Christ reveals or requires any virtues or duties not previously enjoined by the philosophers, or otherwise known to men, but that he has organized a society to enforce them, which constitutes the differential quality of Christianity. We quote still further from the *Preface Supplementary*, because it is the author's own interpretation of his book, and sets out his views in the shortest spaces.

"What states are to the moral virtues of justice and honesty, and armies to the virtues of courage and subordination, that the Christian church is intended to be to all virtues alike, but especially to those which are nursed by no other organization, philanthropy, mercy, forgiveness, &c. When, therefore, the writer has spoken of these virtues as having been introduced among mankind by Christ, he does not mean to say that they had never before been declared by philosophers to be virtues. He has expressly guarded himself, and that several times (see particularly p. 142), against this misunderstanding. He has expressly said (p. 182) that the province of Christianity is not the province of the moralist. But the difference between stating the principles of morality and putting men into a condition to practise them,—between introducing new truths to the lecture-room of the philosopher and introducing them to the markets, and councils, and homes of men,—this difference, though it

seems to some of his readers vague or slight, seems to the writer vast and all-important. He knows something of what is in Seneca and Epictetus, and he duly respects the moralities taught there; but he 'yields all blessing to the name of Him that made them current coin.'

"That Christ has improved the ideal morality of philosophers is not what the writer wishes to maintain, though probably it is true. Nor does he assert, what may also be true, that Christ has improved the moral practice of the average of men."

Thus the author makes the distinctive element in Christianity, not the revelation of peculiar truths, or the requirement of peculiar services and duties correspondent therewith, but the formation of a society, called the church, to nourish and develop the virtues already recognized among men, and inculcated by heathen moralists and philosophers. What now, according to our author, are these virtues thus cherished and propagated by this church, and what are the appliances and forces peculiar to it for promoting them? The virtues specially noted and discussed by him are philanthropy, mercy, resentment, forgiveness. The special power for promoting them is found, first, in what the writer styles "the enthusiasm of humanity" inspired by the person, life, influence, and example of Christ, as a new and extraordinary manifestation in the world, and as the Founder and Head of this new organization; and secondly, His enthusiasm invigorated by the social, organic, disciplinary influence of this society and its symbols. This enthusiasm is a "divine inspiration," in the subject of it, which makes him a "law unto himself," and emancipates him from all the fetters of outward literal law, even though that law be divine. "This then it is which is wanted to raise the feeling of humanity into an enthusiasm; when the precept of love has been given, an image must be set before the eyes of those who are called upon to obey it, an ideal or type of man which may be noble and amiable enough to raise the whole race and make the meanest member of it sacred with reflected glory.

"Did not Christ do this? Did the command to love go forth to those who had never seen a human being they could revere? Could his followers turn upon him and say, How can we love a creature so degraded, full of vile wants and contemptible pas-

sions . . . It is precisely what was wanting to raise the love of man as man to enthusiasm. An eternal glory has been shed upon the human race by the love Christ bore to it. And it was because the Edict of Universal Love went forth to men whose hearts were in no cynical mood, but possessed with a spirit of devotion to a man, that words which at any other time, however grandly they might sound, would have been but words, penetrated so deeply, and along with the law of love the power of love was given. Therefore also the first Christians were enabled to dispense with philosophical phrases, and instead of saying that they loved the ideal of man in man, could simply say and feel that they loved Christ in every man.

"We have here the very kernel of the Christian moral scheme. We have distinctly before us the end Christ proposed to himself, and the means he considered adequate to the attainment of it. His object was, instead of drawing up, after the example of previous legislators, a list of actions prescribed, allowed, and prohibited, to give his disciples a universal test by which they might discover what it was right and what it was wrong to do. Now, as the difficulty of discovering what is right arises commonly from the prevalence of self-interest in our minds, and as we commonly behave rightly to any one for whom we feel affection or sympathy, Christ considered that he who could feel sympathy for all would behave rightly to all. But how to give to the meagre and narrow hearts of men such enlargement? How to make them capable of a universal sympathy? Christ believed it possible to bind men to their kind, but on one condition—that they were first bound fast to himself. He stood forth as the representative of men, he identified himself with the cause, and with the interests of all human beings, he was destined, as he began before long obscurely to intimate, to lay down his life for them. Few of us sympathize originally and directly with this devotion; few of us can perceive in human nature itself any merit sufficient to evoke it. But it is not so hard to love and venerate him who felt it. So vast a passion of love, a devotion so comprehensive, elevated, deliberate, and profound, has not elsewhere been in any degree approached save by some of his imitators. And as love provokes love, many have found it possible to conceive for Christ an attach-

ment the closeness of which no words can describe, a veneration so possessing and absorbing the man within them, that they have said, 'I live no more, but Christ lives in me.' Now such a feeling carries with it of necessity the feeling of love for all human beings. It matters no longer what quality men may exhibit; amiable or unamiable, as the brothers of Christ, as belonging to his sacred and consecrated kind, as the objects of his love in life and death, they must be dear to all to whom he is dear. And those who would for a moment know his heart and understand his life must begin by thinking of the whole race of man, and of each member of the race, with awful reverence and hope.

"Love, wheresoever it appears, is in its measure a law-making power. 'Love is *dutiful* in thought and deed.' And as the lover of his country is free from the temptation to treason, so is he who loves Christ secure from the temptation to injure any human being." *Ecce Homo*, pp. 179—80.

This enthusiasm is what is meant by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, both as to his nature, and his indwelling in the souls of Christians whereby they are Christ's.

"It was fully understood by the early church that the enthusiastic or elevated condition of mind was the distinctive and essential mark of a Christian. St. Paul, having asked some converts whether they had received this divine inspiration since their conversion, and receiving for answer that they had not heard there was any such divine inspiration abroad, demanded in amazement what then they had been baptized into." Pp. 160—1.

The Holy Ghost then of *Ecce Homo* is this divine inspiration or "enthusiasm of humanity," which he describes as follows: "Our investigation into the character of the law under which the members of the Christian commonwealth are called to live, has led us to the discovery that in the strict sense of the word no such law exists, it being characteristic of this commonwealth that every member of it is a lawgiver to himself. Every Christian, we learn, has a divine inspiration which dictates to him in all circumstances the right course of action, which inspiration is the passion of humanity raised to a high energy by contemplation of Christ's character, and by the society of those in

whom the same enthusiasm exists. We cease, therefore, henceforth to speak of a Christian law, and endeavour instead to describe in its large outlines the Christian character; that is to say, the new views, feelings, and habits produced in the Christian by his guiding enthusiasm." P. 195.

And still further: "It was the inspiration, the law-making power, that gave Christ and his disciples courage to shake themselves *free from the fetters even of a divine law.*" P. 198.

It is scarcely necessary to say that this annuls all objective laws, all scriptural authority, all divine truths and precepts, beyond the "passion," "enthusiasm," that is to say, the feelings and impulses of each individual soul. These feelings, whether in Christ or his followers, are inspiration, the only inspiration, and the only Holy Ghost or author of inspiration known to this writer. Such a christology speaks for itself, and is beneath criticism. But the author's system, as a whole, is scarcely more erratic and superficial than many of its details, to some of the more remarkable of which we ask attention, as we bring this review to a close. We cannot stop to spread before our readers his evasive uncertainty in regard to the reality and extent of Christ's miracles, and the normal authority of the word, or any portion thereof; or the myths and arbitrary glosses which, with strange audacity, he superinduces upon such plain evangelical narratives as those concerning our Saviour's temptation, the woman taken in adultery, the portraiture of John the Baptist; the prayer of our Lord on the cross for his crucifiers, and, in general, the unbridled license which he uses with the text and exegesis of Scripture. Many of these have been forcibly exhibited in an able but just critique on the volume, in the *London Quarterly Review* for April, 1866. We cannot forbear, however, calling attention to some points which reveal more fully the drift of his system.

He claims that Christ amplified and elevated the sphere of morality, by giving it a positive character. The Old Testament was mainly prohibitory. The New Testament deals chiefly in positive commands. His language is, p. 201, "Now in what consisted precisely the addition made by Christ to morality? It has been already shown that Christ raised the feeling of humanity from being a feeble restraining power to be

an inspiring passion. The Christian moral reformation may indeed be summed up in this—humanity changed from a restraint to a motive. We shall be prepared therefore to find that while earlier moralities had dealt chiefly in prohibitions, Christianity deals in positive commands. And precisely this is the case, precisely this difference made the Old Testament seem antiquated to the first Christians. They had passed from a region of passive into a region of active morality. The old legal formula began '*thou shalt not*,' the new begins with '*thou shalt*.' The young man who had kept the whole law—that is, who had refrained from a number of actions—is commanded to do something, to sell his goods and feed the poor. Condemnation passed under the Mosaic law upon him who had sinned, who had done something forbidden—the soul that sinneth shall die;—Christ's condemnation is pronounced upon those who had not done good, I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat."

It would be difficult to stray further from the truth. The Old Testament, in general and in detail, not only charges us to "cease to do evil," but to "learn to do well." The decalogue, even where its form is negative, carries, according to the understanding of all Christendom, and as interpreted throughout the Scriptures, the implication of the contrary positive virtues. And surely, it can scarcely be questioned that the New Testament abounds in prohibitions as well as commands. Christ disowns and consigns to perdition the workers of iniquity. Are not bitterness, wrath, clamour, evil-speaking, fornication, uncleanness, covetousness, lying, all unfruitful works of darkness, abundantly prohibited there under direst threatenings? Why then venture such rash and groundless representations of the teachings of Scripture? Why such wresting them from their obvious import to give plausibility to a chimera of his own imagination?

But what now does our author set forth to be the conditions of membership in the church, and the import of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper?

In regard to the former he says: "Assuredly those who represent Christ as presenting to men an abstruse theology, and saying to them peremptorily, 'Believe, or be damned,' have the coarsest conception of our Saviour in the world. He will

reject, he tells us, those who refuse to clothe the naked or tend the sick, those whose lamps have gone out, those who have buried their talents, not those whose minds are poorly furnished with theological knowledge." Pp. 90, 91. The truth or falsity of all this depends entirely on what the author means by "abstruse theology," "theological knowledge," &c. He not obscurely indicates in the chapter on membership in Christ's kingdom, from which the foregoing is extracted, that such things as the Divinity, Atonement, and Resurrection of our Lord, are so included in them, that belief in them should not be exacted as a condition of admission into Christ's kingdom. But this is more explicitly and unquestionably put in his account of the qualifications for Baptism. Construing our Lord's declarations to Nicodemus in the extreme literal and ritualistic sense as averring that there is "no way into the Theocracy (church) but through baptism," he gives us the following view of the qualifications for this sacrament. "But among the followers of the Legislator there is but one common quality. All, except a very few adventurers who have joined him under a mistake and will soon withdraw, have some degree of what he calls faith. All look up to him, trust in him, are prepared to obey him and to sacrifice something for him. He requires no more. This is a valid title to citizenship in the Theocracy. But in habits and character they differ as much as the individuals in any other crowd. Some are sunk in vice, others lead blameless lives; some have cultivated minds, others are rude peasants; some offer to Jehovah prayers conceived in the style of Hebrew psalmists and prophets, others worship some monstrous idol of the terrified imagination or passionless abstraction of philosophy. It is the object of the society into which this *motley crowd* are now gathered gradually to elevate each member of it, to cure him of vice, to soften his rudeness, to deliver him from the dominion of superstitious fears or intellectual conceits. But this is the point towards which the society tends, not that with which it begins." Pp. 94, 95.

This would seem to teach that, no matter what enormities of belief any may entertain, even in regard to Christ himself, and although they may be as yet unreclaimed idolaters or profligates, they still have a right to membership in this society—

the Christian church. All that is required is a willingness to be enrolled among Christ's followers and to be baptized, even though they bow down to dumb idols, or conceive of him as a Socrates, a Voltaire, a Nimrod, or a Napoleon. A simple answer to all this is our Lord's last and great commission, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not, shall be damned." The Ethiopian eunuch was admitted to baptism only on condition of believing with all his heart, and he confessed his faith that Jesus was the Son of God. To what purpose then does this author tell us in his *Preface Supplementary*, that "Christ, instead of declaring beneficence to be a virtue, merges all virtue in beneficence. In his account of the judgment of men (Matt. xxv), all that we commonly call morality disappears; not a word is said of honesty, purity, fidelity; active beneficence is made the one and only test: those who have fed the hungry are accepted, those who have not done so are rejected. And the same view of virtue as necessarily and principally an activity is presented in the Parable of the Talents, where all that men possess is represented as capital belonging to the Supreme King, the interest of which He exacts under the heaviest penalties," &c. &c.

Is not this clearly negatived by the general tenor, and the explicit, repeated, manifold averments of our Lord and his apostles? Does he not declare in regard to the unregenerate, the unbelieving, the impenitent, the unconverted, the doers of iniquity, that they cannot enter the kingdom of heaven, or escape perdition? And do not his inspired apostles teach in his name that "neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God"? that all liars shall have their part in the lake of fire? and that nothing shall enter heaven that defileth or maketh a lie?

But let us look at the author's account of the Lord's Supper and its import. "A common meal is the most natural and universal way of expressing, maintaining, and as it were ratifying relations of friendship. The spirit of antiquity regarded the meals of human beings as having the nature of sacred rites

(*sacra mensæ*). If therefore it sounds degrading to compare the Christian Communion to a club-dinner, this is not owing to any essential difference between the two things, but to the fact that the moderns connect less dignified associations with meals than the ancients did, and that most clubs have a far less serious object than the Christian Society. The Christian Communion *is* a club-dinner: but the club is the New Jerusalem; God and Christ are members of it; death makes no vacancy in its lists, but at its banquet-table the perfected spirits of just men, with an innumerable company of angels, sit down beside those who have not yet surrendered their bodies to the grave." *Ecce Homo*, p. 178.

And again: "It is precisely this intense personal devotion, this habitual feeding on the character of Christ, so that the essential nature of the Master seems to pass into and become the essential nature of the servant—loyalty carried to the point of self-annihilation—that is expressed by the words 'eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ.'" P. 190.

This needs no comment. The work, as a whole, is one more of the multiform attempts of sceptical ingenuity to make out a Christ, without any "doctrine of Christ," a Christianity, without any doctrine of Christianity. Of course it is a failure. Even the laudatory article in the *North British Review*, in which the writer shrinks from all rebuke beyond the most tender and dainty criticism, signalizes this great defect, and avers the impossibility of finding any renovating power in Christ disjoined from a true doctrine of Christ. It is not possible for such views of our Saviour as amount to a "false Christ," or to no Christ, to exert any genuine saving or transforming efficacy upon men. No view of Jesus which ignores or repudiates the "truth as it is in Jesus," can avail to renew and sanctify the soul. It is not a being of some unknown order that is our Redeemer, nor some merely superhuman creature; not a man only, nor God only; but a person who is both God and man, the Word made flesh, God blessed over all for ever. This glorious being indeed was the greatest of Teachers and Martyrs. But he was no mere teacher or martyr. To have been all this and no more, would have left him still impotent to kindle any "enthusiasm of humanity," any faith which works

by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world. It is as "bearing our sins," and being "made a curse for us" on the cross, that this cross becomes the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, and that his blood cleanseth from all sin. It is by his Holy Spirit, as a Divine Person—not as a mere "enthusiasm of humanity," indwelling and inworking in us that we are made "new creatures in Christ Jesus." The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. As to all this, let history be our witness. Where has Christianity been a power on earth, after the divinity, vicarious sacrifice, resurrection of Christ, and the renewing work of the Holy Ghost have died out from the faith of men? Indeed, when these have gone, what of Christianity is left? The philanthropic virtues still surviving among Socinians are but the inheritance handed down from the ancestral faith they have repudiated; the last reflections and radiations from that Sun of Righteousness which is now left beyond the horizon of their faith.

We see announced as in preparation another work by the author of "Ecce Homo," entitled, "Christ as the Creator of Modern Theology and Religion." We look for little light on this subject from one who is capable of offering the contents of this volume as a fit presentation of Christ—one which he may fairly summon men to behold as a just portraiture of the Incarnate Son of God.

We cannot better give a summation of our views of this production than in the concluding words of the article in the *London Quarterly Review* for April, 1866, above referred to.

"To refute all the errors which abound in 'Ecce Homo,' would be tedious and useless. The author claims to have studied the subject with especial regard to the facts, and he perverts the commonest particulars, which lie on the surface of the Gospels. He writes with an affectation of philosophical depth, and numerous passages in his treatise exhibit either ignorance or defiance of the elementary principles which are familiar to children and peasants. He disguises every-day truths by a pomp of disquisition and a wordiness of style which darken what is simple instead of elucidating what is obscure. His diffuse phraseology is wanting in precision, and his ideas

are often in the last degree vague and sometimes contradictory. His performance is just the reverse of its pretensions, and is inaccurate, superficial, and unsound. Whatever may be his creed —which he has carefully concealed—his want of candour in dealing with his authorities, his presumption, and his rashness, deserve the severest censure. That his book should have obtained the suffrages of any members of the Church of England, is melancholy evidence of their slight acquaintance with their faith and their Bibles. . . . . Happily, there is a vast body of educated men who are better informed, and while error is perpetually changing its form and is only born to die, the grand truths of Christianity are passed on with accelerated impulse from generation to generation. They were never more in the ascendant than now; and there is this good, at least, in the assaults of adversaries, that they promote inquiry and help to establish the revelation they were designed to overthrow."

ART. VII.—*The Hebrew Prophets, translated afresh from the original with regard to the Anglican version, and with illustrations for English readers.* By ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D. D., Vicar of Broad-Chalke, Wilts, formerly Fellow and Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. Vol. I.—The Prophets of Israel and Judah during the Assyrian Empire. 8vo. pp. 450. London and Edinburgh. 1866.

THIS book has no particular claim to attention from any novelty in its contents, its methods or results. It is, however, noteworthy as marking a fresh stage in the process which has for some time been going forward, and which bids fair to transfer to our own religious literature, if not to our own shores, the battle which has been waging in Germany from the beginning of the present century.

The English and American churches are accustomed to contests with avowed opposers, with philosophical deists who deny the reality of revealed religion, and frivolous scoffers who mock

at sacred things and point their profane jests at the inspired word of God. These have assailed not the essence of Christianity, but its evidences. The ponderous blows which were given or received, and the poisoned arrows which were discharged or warded off, did not affect the contents of the Scriptures so much as their claims upon men's credence and obedience. Friend and foe alike united in the confession that this volume professed to be a supernatural communication from God, and that it contained a definite system of doctrines and precepts propounded to men as a divine rule of faith and duty. By deist, infidel, and Christian, the Bible was understood substantially alike. The question in dispute was not what it claimed to be, nor what it taught; but whether its claims were valid, and its teachings true and authoritative.

At the opposite extreme from these battles with the open antagonists of all revealed religion, lay the controversies on points of doctrine with which our churches were familiar among themselves. Here the divinity and authority of the Scriptures did not come into question. Whatever skirmishing there might be over minor and unessential details, or however the dispute might wax hot over weighty and momentous doctrines vital in their bearing on evangelical religion, the foundations were left untouched. To the combatants on either side, the Bible was the word of God and contained a system of truth divinely authoritative.

A far subtler and bolder form of attack than either of these indigenous species of warfare has, however, been developed abroad. It proceeds not from professed foes outside the church, but from men who call themselves Christians, and who resent as unfounded and malignant the charge of heresy or unbelief,—who occupy prominent positions in evangelical communions and fill noted theological chairs,—men in some cases of immense and varied learning, who make the Scriptures the study of their lives, and are enthusiastic in their admiration of the sacred writers. And these men fortified by their position in the church, by their extensive research and their unquestioned ability, as well as by their professions of candour and of respect and veneration for the Scriptures, direct their assault not merely at the external evidences of revealed religion, nor

at particular doctrines of the word of God which may be more or less important, but by a dexterous use of criticism and philology they undertake to explode all that has been most surely believed from the days of the prophets and apostles. The entire supernatural view of religion is simply a stupendous mistake and misunderstanding; and nothing more is needed to demonstrate this than a careful study of the volume which Christendom has made the basis of its faith. The inner mechanism of these books sufficiently explains their true character. There was no miracle, no prophecy, no immediate revelation in the case. Before a fair and candid interpretation and an intelligent criticism all mystery disappears, and the literary products of Palestine are to be classed with those of Greece and Rome and other lands. The inspired men, the psalmists and the prophets of the Hebrews, were simply sages, poets, and orators, admirable for their genius and penetration, their eloquence and poetic fire, but in no other sense the messengers of God or the interpreters of his will, than the same classes are among every people and in every age.

As remote though not uninterested spectators, we have been wont to look serenely on this scene of strife, congratulating ourselves on our safe distance and our sheltered position. We have been affected by it much as we used to be by the clangour of transatlantic arms before these last few terrible years, while we securely trusted that the shock of war could never reach ourselves. From these vain dreams we were rudely roused by the breaking out of the late rebellion. It was not an affair with the Indian tribes menacing our outposts, which the despatch of a few regiments might quell. It was not a mere question of policy to be settled peacefully at the polls. It was a desperate struggle for the nation's life against those who had sworn to support the Constitution, but who hoped by a bold *coup d'état* to seize upon the government, possessing themselves of the national forts, supplies, and ammunition, turning our own guns upon us, and beleaguering the capitol.

The warning notes of preparation for a like struggle over the essentials of the Christian faith are already sounding in our ears; and its friends and defenders must equip themselves thoroughly for it. Hitherto it has been chiefly the light

skirmishes that have appeared upon the field, but the tramp of the heavy armed legions is close behind them.

German opinions and conclusions have been imported piecemeal, and sometimes even ludicrously and unskilfully urged after they had been abandoned by their authors, like foreign fashions thrown upon the market after the commodities had ceased to be saleable at home. German books of the destructive sort have been translated and circulated among us, but as these were prepared for another public, and presupposed a very different state of popular opinion and a widely variant taste, they had little influence on the general mind. There were those, however, to whom these novelties proved welcome, and by whom their startling conclusions were eagerly embraced. This number has been steadily increasing, and as a consequence these ideas are becoming naturalized; they are cast into the forms of English thought, wrought into shapes more captivating to English minds, and native centres created for their wider and more vigorous dissemination. Writers in leading Quarterlies, and even in influential daily journals, have put forth these views in laboured articles and in sprightly paragraphs. Men of eminence in letters and science, and dignitaries of the church, have tacitly assumed their correctness or entered the lists in their defence. The only Introduction to the Old Testament from an English pen, which makes any pretension to represent the existing state of Biblical learning, is wholly in the same interest, the awkward and ill-digested, but learned and copious treatise of Davidson. And now in the volume under consideration a beginning is made at new translations and commentaries, from which the idea of a supernatural revelation is carefully excluded, and every occasion seized to scout the notion as the offspring of bigotry and prejudice, or the remnant of an antiquated superstition.

The author, Rowland Williams, D. D., is well known by his paper on Bunsen's Biblical Researches, in the famous "Essays and Reviews," by a volume of sermons in the same vein, entitled, "Rational Godliness," by his Christianity and Hinduism, and other minor publications.

The estimate which he puts upon the prophets will appear from such expressions as the following: "The words were

spoken by the prophet after the measure of his own age, with its limitation of horizon and of feeling." P. 6. "Prophecy is not a delegation of the Divine omniscience, but a foreboding from trust in the Divine justice, tinged possibly by passion, limited certainly by circumstance." P. 40. "The eternal power of the prophets springs ever fresh, not from whatever gift of prediction they may extraordinarily have possessed, but from that which they have in common with ourselves, their sight of God, their hatred of tyranny and hypocrisy, their courage in denouncing wrong, their awe-stricken prayerfulness, their poetical fire, their manly generosity." P. 216. Again he speaks of "the prophet's own mind impelled by presentiment, as by something divine, as we ourselves in some vast calamity, or amidst organized wrong veiled by falsehood, forebode by faith in God that it cannot be for ever." P. 339. And of "fervent forebodings, which have a tinge of prediction, though not in the external sense commonly conceived." P. 355.

The prophets, then, were under no extraordinary Divine influence. What they uttered was not the immediate communications of God's Spirit, but the forebodings of their own minds. It follows from this that they could have no infallible prescience of the future; and there cannot in strictness have been any such thing as a fulfilment of their predictions. This conclusion he does not pretend to evade, but explicitly draws and undertakes to establish it in detail.

He says, indeed, p. 96, "With God no prediction can be impossible;" and again, p. 150, "No religious mind, least of all my own (whatever may have been polemically imputed), would deem it impossible for God to foretell the captivity a century before it happened."

It is here confessed that the clear foresight of the future, however distant, is not in itself incredible. There is no *a priori* necessity forbidding it. God certainly foreknows what will come to pass; and if he has chosen, he may have communicated that knowledge to the prophets. No man is authorized to declare that the prophets can have uttered no real predictions. Whether they have done so in actual fact, must be determined by an unbiassed examination of their writings. To such an examination our author confidently makes his appeal, and pro-

fesses himself willing to abide its issue. He boldly avers that all the books of the prophets do not afford a single instance of supernatural foresight. The method by which this conclusion is reached, is as extraordinary as the conclusion itself.

Of Hosea he alleges, p. 91, that no proof can be given that any event absolutely future, when the writing was published, was therein foretold. Even if this were really so, it is a palpable evasion of the point at issue. We may leave out of view the Messianic predictions, which are disposed of by a very summary process; and we may allow it to be an open question, whether Hosea survived the fall of Samaria, and published the book of his prophecies after that event; and yet, if Hosea uttered predictions which were afterwards fulfilled, it is as fatal to the theory as if they had been from the first committed to writing.

Here is the record of a ministry covering the last sixty years of the existence of the kingdom of the ten tribes, the ever recurring burden of which, from first to last, is the destruction of this ungodly kingdom, and the exile of the people. This prediction is further set in combination with the announcement of the future fate of the house of Jeroboam, which occurred in the outset of his ministry, and with arguments, expostulations, and exhortations, which imply that the kingdom was still standing, and space was still allowed for repentance. Now the people amongst whom Hosea laboured for the space of nearly two generations, must have known whether his ministry was really such as is herein described; whether he had really announced, as he here claims, the fall of Jeroboam's house, and at the same time and thenceforward the overthrow and captivity of the ten tribes. If he had not, and it was, as it must have been, well known to the people that he had not, how did this book ever gain credence, or its author attain any other reputation than that of an impostor instead of a prophet.

But apart from the esteem in which it was held, it is apparent from its whole spirit, style, and structure, that it belongs not after but before the Assyrian captivity began. The indignant rebukes, the impassioned entreaties, the moving appeals, which are based upon the predictions and mingled with them, which presuppose at the same time that they justify them,

would be without an object, would be wholly insupposable after the kingdom was actually overturned and the people exiled. From the very tenor of these utterances they must have been first made before the things predicted in them had come to pass. Whether they were committed to writing prior to the fulfilment or not, is a matter of no consequence, since we have in the popular reception of the book the same confirmation of its being a truthful record as in the credit attached to any history of recent and well-known events.

But there is a further peculiarity of this prophetic announcement which affords a demonstration not only that the prediction was uttered before the event, but that it was recorded substantially as it had been uttered, and that no change was made in its form to adapt it to what actually took place. Prophecy is not history; and although real and exact in its correspondence with history, it has nevertheless its own peculiar and distinctive character. Its modes of representation and forms of expression, though justified by the event, are often manifestly such as would not have been employed after the event. This divergence of method arises out of the difference in the ends at which prophecy and history respectively aim, and in the point of view under which they contemplate the same territory. One of its incidental results is the demonstration of the genuine predictive character of the former, and that it is not a *vaticinium ex eventu*.

Thus the fact of the coming overthrow of the ungodly kingdom of the ten tribes and the exile of the people is repeatedly declared, and with all distinctness. But there is a singular obscurity clouding the locality of the exile. The prophet says at one time that they shall be carried into Egypt (viii. 13, ix. 6); at another, that they shall be carried into Assyria, (x. 6); at another still, that they shall be carried into both Egypt and Assyria, (ix. 3, xi. 11); and once again, that they shall not be carried into Egypt but into Assyria, (xi. 5). This variety of statement is seized upon to disparage the prophecy and point the charge of vacillation and mistake. It is, however, apparent at once that this allegation is inconsistent with the other, that the book was written after the things predicted had come to pass. Both cannot be true. And in point of fact neither is.

Such sentences could not have been written after it was known from the event that the exile was in Assyria. And on the other hand, the assumption of vacillation and error is gratuitously made. If we will deal with the language of the prophet, as we would with that of any other respectable author, we will scarcely believe that he has thus grossly contradicted himself almost in consecutive paragraphs; we shall suspect that beneath the literal inconsistency there is some consistent meaning. And it will require little penetration to discover that the whole is capable of being readily harmonized. And the same process which will reconcile these superficially divergent statements with one another, will likewise reconcile them all with the actual fact. Egypt is the ideal name of a land of bondage. To carry Israel back into Egypt was to reduce them to the same condition in which their fathers had been in that ancient empire. But, as the prophet himself explains, the Egypt to which they were to return was not the literal territory so called, but the Assyrian should be their king; just as we speak of Vandals and of Hessians in an another than the strictly ethnic sense.

Perhaps also the words of the prophet may find a further justification in the not improbable assumption that while the great body of exiles were led away to Assyria straggling bands may have been taken into Egypt, or have fled thither to escape Assyrian oppression, as was the case at a later period with the Jews when the mass of the people were carried to Babylon. In any event the prediction is amply verified, and yet its terms are such as to preclude any other supposition than that it was really a prediction. It must have been uttered in this form if not actually committed to writing, before the issue could be divined by human sagacity.

The subterfuge thus ineffectually resorted to in the case of Hosea may serve as a sample of the mode of dealing with those predictions which were fulfilled in the life-time of the prophets who uttered them. The bald suspicion or the confident assertion that the prophecies have been modified so as to adapt them to the event after it occurred and create the appearance of a foresight which did not exist, is counted sufficient to set them aside. No proof is offered to sustain this gratuitous conjec-

ture. No pains are taken to free it from the difficulties by which it is pressed. No explanation is given of the mode in which these spurious prophecies could gain credence in the circumstances supposed, or how the people could be induced to believe that events had been foretold, not to their fathers but to themselves, of which they had never heard until they took place; or how such bad faith is consistent with the character of the prophets, whom Dr. Williams represents as sincere, upright and God-fearing men; or how his hypothesis can be reconciled with the internal evidence to the contrary afforded by the structure of the prophecies in question.

His eagerness to rid himself of predictions by making the writings of the prophets posterior to the events to which they refer, occasionally leads him to conclusions which put even the critics of Germany to shame. Thus Nahum's prophecy of the fall of Nineveh is converted into a retrospect of her doom by the magic of a few prophetic preterites and the vividness with which the overthrow of that mighty city is pictured. "The first impression," he says, (p. 434), "left by a dispassionate perusal of our prophet, is that of contemporaneousness or subsequence to the events which he narrates. The defenders are fallen, the assailants hasten to the wall, the siege-screen is set fast, the city is taken, her daughters moan as doves, her people refuse to rally, she becomes a pool of waters. This impression need not be removed by the subsequent reflection, with which in his closing epode the prophet travels back into the counsels of eternity for the causes of the event over which he exults." What Dr. Williams here calls "travelling back into the counsels of eternity" is just the prediction of an event which is plainly represented as not having yet occurred, but as certain to take place in the future. It is not the past of Nineveh, but her coming fate which is set forth and pronounced inevitable, its grounds exhibited, and a striking example adduced to confirm what in itself appears so incredible. It is manifest that this is either a prediction, or that its author designed that it should be regarded as a prediction. And in either case the vivid pictures of the preceding chapter cannot have been intended to be understood as a description of what is already past.

The fact is, as the mass of the readers of this book have

believed from the beginning, and as modern critics of all schools concede, the prophecy of Nahum contains indubitable evidence of having been uttered at or near the time of Sennacherib's disastrous defeat, which is treated as prophetic of the ultimate overthrow of this proud oppressing empire. This is confirmed by the position of the book in the collection of the minor prophets. And, as Dr. Williams observes, "Josephus distinctly places Nahum a hundred and fifteen years before Nineveh's fall."

Under these circumstances, to imagine that the date of the prophecy is settled adversely to all internal and external considerations, by saying "that the prophet of God meant what he said when he affirmed Nineveh to have been captured," is as intelligent as it would be to sever from its context some passage in which a historian makes use of the present tense in speaking of the past, and infer from this the contemporaneousness of the author with what he describes.

The methods already described of escaping the evidence of supernatural foresight are freely employed in such cases as the foregoing. But when the fulfilment took place after the prophet's death, and no chronological hypothesis can bridge the interval, another and more summary process becomes necessary. The obnoxious prophecies are disposed of by the critic's knife; and whatever it might be inconvenient to retain, since it would contravene the point to be established, is unhesitatingly rejected as spurious.

It is astonishing that a clearheaded Englishman can be deluded by such a palpable circle as that involved in this destructive criticism, or that even under the pressure of a foregone conclusion he can be induced to resort to it. As a matter of course the critic finds exactly what he wishes to find. He sets out with the prepossession that there is no real prediction to be found in the prophets. Every prediction, that can be disposed of in no other way, is consequently alleged to have been written after the event. Then having arranged the dates *ad libitum* in detail, he turns round and claims that inasmuch as all these prophecies were written after the event to which they refer, there is among them no real prediction.

If this method is allowable there is no difficulty in proving

anything that a man may undertake to prove. If Dr. Williams had been so disposed he might have shown with equal ease that the Israelites were never under a kingly government, and that the existence of royalty among them is merely a traditional blunder. The critical process would be simply this. Inasmuch as there were no kings in Israel, the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, which profess to record their history, must be spurious; they were written doubtless sometime after the exile, when the Jews, chafing under foreign domination, sought to gather credit to their own nation by asserting that they too had had a race of kings. All the scattered passages in other books which allude to or presuppose the existence of kings, must likewise be culled out and referred to the same origin. After this expunging process has been completed, it can then be claimed that no reference to kings or a kingdom is to be found in the entire genuine literature of the nation; and consequently the existence of a regal government in Israel is a figment and a chimera.

Nothing in the history of opinion is susceptible of a readier demonstration, as has often been shown, than that the extravagance of modern criticism is the offspring of disbelief in a supernatural revelation. However this may be disguised or disclaimed, nothing is more certain than that the so called rational grounds of this criticism are uniformly subordinated to the doctrinal principle from which the whole has proceeded. The alleged diversities of style and diction and range of ideas and mode of conception, which are paraded as evidences that certain books of the Bible, or parts of books, cannot belong to the authors to whom they are traditionally referred, were never thought of as involving any such conclusion until the necessity was created for it by the exigencies of modern unbelief. And that this conclusion still rests upon its original premises, and not upon the other arguments by which it is professedly sustained, is apparent from the fact that these latter are deemed conclusive by those who urge them only when the doctrinal consideration co-exists with them; and that in spite of all disagreement among themselves as to the state of the argument or the literary aspects of the case, the critics uniformly agree in their conclusions, so far and only so far as the rejection of

every passage involving the supernatural, which cannot otherwise be evaded or explained away.

Dr. Williams himself, with all his professions of impartiality and freedom from doctrinal bias, finds one passage in Isaiah to be spurious on account of "the spirit of charity" which it breathes. P. 335. And others on the directly opposite ground of desiring "revenge upon oppressors," which he alleges to be "the spirit engendered by the sufferings of the exile, and expressed in the poems subsequent to the return." P. 401. Though vague assertions of difference of style are made to disprove the genuineness of certain passages, the resemblance in others may be so close that he can scarcely distinguish between them, and yet the conclusion is the same, as on p. 292, where, after urging that "the greatest masters of Hebrew criticism" deny the style of certain chapters to be that of Isaiah, he adds, "I would not be understood, as if the difference of verbal colour in style appeared to my own ear sufficient alone to justify the dissociation of this chapter from Isaiah. Many both of the thoughts and phrases appear to me so remarkably like, that if the author is not Isaiah, he imitated Isaiah." Elsewhere, with all his literary arguments in full force, he is willing to admit the suggestion of genuineness, provided it is not allowed to make in favour of prophetic foresight. Thus, pp. 354, 5: "The moral horizon of the chapters is such as to suit the period of the Babylonish captivity. . . . . Such is substantially the view of most critics. . . . . If any one prefers making Isaiah the author, he may either call the entire piece predictive, *or he may easily imagine* dealings with the Assyrian in the less fortunate days of Ahaz or Hezekiah, to which parts of the picture will, not quite perfectly, correspond."

On p. 37 he propounds what he calls "a grave critical question." "There are scattered at the end of several scriptures, both in the Psalms and prophetical books, little pieces not always accordant with the main theme, but singularly appropriate to the exile or the return from Babylon." Do these form an integral part of the productions in which they are found, or were they added during or after the exile? Of this he says, p. 38, "An impartial answer to this question is, that we have no such evidence of the former state of the books as

would render such addition impossible; nor yet proof of its having actually taken place. We shall never quite know, how far the labours of Ezra, or of those to whom his name has been given, extended in arranging as well as editing the canon."

It is strange that Dr. Williams does not see that the very magnitude of the hypothesis here suggested must destroy it, and that it is hopelessly encumbered instead of corroborated by the number of interpolations which he is obliged to assume. Anticipations of the exile of varying distinctness are found scattered through all the preëxilic books from the writings of Moses downward; and this not only at the end of psalms or prophecies, but in the body of them as well, and in varying magnitude from a single verse or paragraph, to sections of many continuous chapters. All these must be interpolations purposely inserted, or fragments from anonymous authors, accidentally blended with writings otherwise genuine. In the former case the intelligence of the people and the good faith of the custodians of Scripture are gratuitously impugned, and their reverence for the inspired word insulted, notwithstanding Dr. Williams's singular notion that such additions were possible, and are not likely to have been thought wrong. In the latter case it must be accounted for that, while such brief books as Obadiah, dating from the earliest period of written prophecy, are preserved distinct and assigned to their proper authors, the writers of these added passages, some of which are much longer and belong to the most striking and important parts of the Old Testament, and which exerted a powerful influence in the exile, were wholly unknown to the collectors of the canon, although they lived almost, if not quite, in Ezra's own days. Nay, they had not only themselves dropped completely from sight, but the knowledge of their writings as distinct productions was lost, so that they were innocently attached to, or promiscuously mingled with, writings of a former age, so widely separate in subject and in character that critics at the present day can infallibly sunder them.

And what is still more remarkable, in this unheard of falsification of the entire national literature, it so happens that there is scarcely an interpolation or a suspected passage, which is not a prediction of the exile or of something connected with

the exile. Now if, as Dr. Williams would have us believe, this is purely a literary question to be determined apart from all doctrinal bias, which is the more natural and credible supposition, that the entire literature of the nation has been tampered with to this extent, nobody knows by whom, or how, or when, or for what purpose,—or that this idea of the exile of an unfaithful people was before the minds of the sacred penmen from the beginning, and gained clearness and consistency as time advanced? If their anticipations were justified by the event, and the accuracy of their foreshadowing was such as to show that they were enlightened by the Omniscient Spirit of God, should this be allowed to alter the conditions of the problem in its purely literary aspect? Can Dr. Williams in fairness claim that it does, after affirming that "there can be no harm in believing prophecy; but great harm in distorting Scripture to create it." P. 214.

But criticism is only one of the weapons which our author has at command to rid himself of obnoxious predictions. Where this fails, or he is indisposed to resort to it, he can make an equally effective use of interpretation. It may not always be convenient to locate a prophecy after its fulfilment; and at any rate some variety of method will relieve the tedious monotony of an uniform process. Accordingly upon occasion predictions are so explained as to divert attention from their actual fulfilment, and thus conceal the evidence of supernatural foresight. Sometimes they are made to be a mere presentiment or vague anticipation. Thus (p. 22), "The idea of foretelling future events with articulate prediction (as distinct from devout or hopeful forebodings) is not intended here."

Or a sense may be put upon them which they do not really contain, and then it can easily be made to appear that they were not fulfilled. Thus (p. 40), "Amos's denunciation was fulfilled, though neither in the time nor by the instruments which he expected." The proof of mistake in the time is given on p. 63: "The prophet, like a puritan or early Quaker or the sterner friars of the 12th century, answers wrathfully, and denounces on his mitred opponent calamities of which we have no record whether they came to pass; or whether God, whose thought is larger than our thought, overruled the too

fervid zeal. We know that Jeroboam died in peace, though Amos, *if he is reported truly by Amaziah*, meant differently." Now it is as plain upon the face of the passage (vii. 9, 10) as can be, that Amos was not truly reported by Amaziah. The former had said that the Lord would "rise against *the house of Jeroboam* with the sword." Amaziah perverts this into "*Jeroboam* shall die by the sword." Where is Dr. Williams's candour then, when he represents the denunciation of Amos as unfulfilled (p. 39), because it did not come to pass "in the reign of Jeroboam, against whose house no sword came from abroad until domestic conspiracy overthrew his son;" where it is moreover to be observed, that the words "from abroad" are gratuitously inserted, not being warranted by the prophet's own language.

The allegation that Amos indicates the wrong instruments for the judgment which he foretells, has no other foundation than a downright mistranslation of iii. 11. Ashdod and Egypt are summoned (iii. 9) to behold the iniquities of Samaria, in order, if possible, to shame this guilty city out of practices base enough to astonish the very heathen. By an unauthorized change of text they are represented as besieging and spoiling the city. The real executioners of the woe here denounced are hinted at, though not named, by the prophet, when he declares (v. 27) that the captivity would be more remote than Damascus.

Again, (p. 299), he says of Isaiah, chap. xiii., "The desolation of Babel, which he expects to follow, is an anticipation, destined in long ages to find fulfilment, though not in the hour or manner conceived by a man, to whom (as the words of the Lord Jesus may teach us) God had not made known the times and the seasons." The fact is that the prophet does not profess to define either the hour or the manner in which the finishing stroke is to be put to the desolation which he so accurately portrays.

Our author, it further appears, is not always particular in the choice of his methods, provided the end is attained of doing away with prediction in the proper sense. On p. 353, he allows the alternative of explaining a passage as "vague presentiment," or supposing it to have been "subsequently filled

in." On p. 332, the prophet "expected" what never took place, or else "uttered a general anticipation," which he admits to have been afterwards verified.

It spite, however, of both criticism and interpretation, cases occur, in which it is impossible not to acknowledge that the words of the prophet have come true. But even this does not disturb our author's serenity. "Prescient inferences from faith in the moral order of God's world have often come true. So the great reformation of the church and the revolution of France were felt due, long before they came." P. 40. Of the overthrow of Sennacherib's host, agreeably to the word of Isaiah, he says, (p. 222), "I incline to consider this a remarkable instance of faith justified by the event; but hardly find it demonstrable that the expectation went beyond foreboding, or that the result transcended the limits of a marvellous providence." His suggestion of an adverse conclusion from "the circumstance that the disaster took place not in Palestine, (Isaiah xiii. 1), but in the Egyptian desert, (Herod. ii. 141)" is sufficiently neutralized by his statement (p. 328) that we do not know "whether it happened in Egypt or in Palestine."

The prophecies respecting Christ, as was to be expected, are dealt with as the rest. Here criticism would be of little avail, and interpretation must do the work. The process of solution is disclosed, pp. 154—7. "What did the prophets mean? Did they predict a Messiah, one anointed with the Holy Spirit, who should be priest, prophet, and king, the glory of Israel, and Saviour of mankind; suffering, yet triumphant; man in form, God in power." . . .

"We have seen in the prophets preceding Micah such glowing anticipations of a brighter future, as fancy loves and faith in God does not disapprove. . . . We have seen also aspirations of the patriot stamp, earnest enough to take the form of predictions, that Jehovah would have mercy on his people Israel, protect their border, restore their exiles, and transmit their inheritance to their children. . . . No one of these prophets hitherto has presented the picture of a hero deliverer, national or spiritual, such as we conceive the Messiah.

"Proceeding to Micah, we still find the general anticipation of good to come and the national hope, both of which are

strikingly combined in the splendid fragment which commences the 4th chapter. . . . Considering how the prophet connects his hopeful fragment with what goes before and after, *i. e.*, first with the destruction which bad teachers would bring upon Zion; secondly, with the triumph which Zion was to win over Assyrian invaders; we can but trace so far a hope of temporal deliverance, and a hope which in some of its features Providence did not see good to fulfil; since the kingdom of the ten tribes did not return to Migdal-eder by Bethlehem or to Jerusalem. We are now at the heart of the question; for if we connect the latter-day fragment, as we ought, with the birth from Bethlehem-Ephratah, a few verses lower, it becomes no longer possible to avoid the conclusion that Micah is speaking of some one being born, or sitting already on Judah's throne, and destined, as he hoped, to consolidate the divided kingdom; certainly he is not speaking of any distant Messiah, earthly or heavenly. . . . It will result that we shall be obliged to consider the citation in our first Gospel, ii. 6, as an adaptation of ancient words instead of an authoritative allegation of prediction; and opinions will differ widely as to the degree of historical justice or fanciful ornament shown in the adaptation.

"Any reader, who is convinced that in this famous passage of Micah, we have no divine prediction of Jesus as the Messiah born in Bethlehem, will be prepared for a similar falling of the scales from his eyes, when he examines other passages."

This long quotation sufficiently reveals how unshrinkingly the theory is carried through, and the process by which it is done. Messianic predictions are resolved in one or other of two ways. First, the prophets' hopes are fixed on some one then living, and they give utterance to their fond expectation of what Hezekiah perhaps, or another descendant of the royal house of David, would do or would become. The prophets, it is true, do not in these connections name Hezekiah or this hopeful prince, whoever he may be. They never say that the wonderful personage of whom they speak, and who is to introduce so blessed an era, is a contemporary. But since there are no real predictions, they must mean that, if they mean anything. At any rate Dr. Williams so assumes. He is satisfied of the fact whether others are or not.

These expectations of the prophets may never have been fulfilled in the person whom they had in mind. They may have been in their terms chimerical and extravagant to the last degree, as applied to an ordinary prince or to any mere man. But Dr. Williams does not consider himself responsible for this any more than he is bound to reconcile the expressions in Virgil's fourth Eclogue with sober history. The hopes of the prophets were disappointed, and their predictions failed in their original intent. Thus these sacred words came to be transferred to other objects and to others still, each fresh disappointment serving but to push them farther into the future, until at length stripped of everything local and material, and receiving a spiritual sense such as the prophet never dreamed of, they were applied to Christ.

If this is so, the Jews are certainly a most extraordinary race of men. The non-fulfilment of his prediction is generally thought to discredit a prophet. But with them, it appears, it is different. The more grossly they are deceived, the greater credit they attach to the fraud. The clearer the evidence of falsehood, the more pertinaciously they will cling to it. Their hope of a Messiah, which has been their one outstanding characteristic for ages, is built upon predictions which were falsified over and over again before their eyes, and which, moreover, were uttered by men who never had any solid claim to the prophetical character.

And, besides, the history of interpretation is exactly the reverse of what the Doctor would have us believe. The steadfastness of Jewish traditions is a universal by-word. Now, as far back as it is possible to trace them, the passages in question were understood of the Messiah. This is their original ancestral faith. It was only after they had in their blindness rejected the Saviour when he came, and these prophecies were turned against them by Christians, and the accuracy of their fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth was shown, that they bethought themselves of other and inferior applications. It is the reference to Hezekiah, not that to the Messiah, which is the afterthought.

The second solvent of Messianic predictions transmutes them into undefined hopes of a blissful future, the good time ever

coming, which men in uneasy circumstances long for, and inextinguishable hope paints as in prospect. This is their ideal for the Jewish people and the Jewish state, the glory, perpetuity, and triumph of the kingdom, the peaceful security of the inhabitants and every form of temporal blessedness; and "can only by some inversion of the prophet's own meaning be applied to Christianity."

But if these prospects of good and imaginings of a happier future are so natural, how comes it to pass that while continuous and uniform with the Hebrew prophets, they were in all the ancient world confined to them. The Greek and Roman poets sang of a golden age in the past, but they never dreamed of one to come. The only exceptions in the whole range of classic literature are a few scanty passages, which, like Virgil's ode addressed to Pollio, betray their origin by expressions and ideas manifestly derived from the Jewish Scriptures.

These foreshadowings of the blissful future were not mere vague and misty aspirations. They were connected in the prophets' minds with a definite era, of which they had formed a clear and consistent image. And although the period is sometimes spoken of merely in the general, without explicit mention in each passage or by each prophet of the person of the great Redeemer, still the current belief of the nation and the unambiguous language of other passages and other prophets, compel to the conclusion that this expected person was the centre about which all their hopes clustered, and that they looked to his coming to introduce the blessings which they describe.

That the prophecies, whether of Messiah's person or of the period to be ushered in by his advent, were cast in the forms of the Old Testament, does not detract from the reality of their inspiration nor the exactness of their fulfilment. This follows necessarily from the preparatory character of the former dispensation. In the intention of God these outward material forms were symbols of higher spiritual things. The people of Israel were placed under the tutelage of the former, that they might be trained to a proper comprehension of the latter. This Dr. Williams substantially admits, apparently not discerning that in so doing he concedes a principle which carries every-

thing else with it that the most fervid supranaturalist can desire.

Thus, p. 29, "If history repeats itself by fresh instances of eternal principles . . . . the old description may become a new prophecy. . . . . And if a holy organization on a spiritual type takes the place of old Israel in God's favour, it may be argued that the threatenings and promises of the old were typically intended of the new; intended not by the prophet, but by the Providence which wields nations, patriots, tyrants, and their destinies, painting in the past the picture of the future."

Again, p. 158, "We need not exclude from the region of devout metaphysics a speculation, how far the dread Being, to whom our thoughts are known long before, may have calculated the impulses of his ancient worshippers and their expression, so that things spoken of old might become applicable again; the songs of Zion become hymns of the church, the praise of King David be transferred to a mental king, the prayer for Solomon, the sorrow of Jeremiah, possibly the birth of Hezekiah repeated in the greatest (we must not say 'the only') Christ."

And, p. 169, "We may even find a pleasure, which if not severely logical, is yet not altogether mystical in turning memory into hope, and in saying to ourselves, though God did not see fit to build up the kingdom of Hezekiah, as Micah expected, He has given that hope a glorious transfiguration by building up a spiritual dominion of One who was the Son of David in figure and poetry—whether in flesh we hardly know. Though the twelve tribes have not found a reunion, which as a thing local and national would not affect any spiritual faith, the hearts of men in distant nations may be knit together by the free Spirit which once spoke narrower, and now speaks wider hopes. The Holy Land is wherever God is. The prophets are wherever free men worship in truth." Once more, p. 224. "Some portions are so local and temporal as the exaltation of Mount Zion above other mountains, that our own Master, Christ, the only infallible interpreter, has reversed them by his doctrine, and taught his followers that the fulfilment of such things lies in their expansion; hence they fulfil

in such a sense as that in which the forest of to-day fulfils the acorn of a millenium ago."

Here is a confession that in the orderings of God there is a correspondence between the utterances of the prophets wrapped in the temporary forms of the ancient economy and the spiritual and enduring realities of the gospel. The whole Old Testament is thus one vast prophecy of the New, of which the verbal predictions of the Messiah are but the culminating points. And the more attentively this correspondence between the Old and the New in God's kingdom is studied, the more conviction will ripen into certainty that we are not in the region of accident or human caprice, but of Divine foreordination. And the more narrowly we inspect the coherence of this great preparatory scheme in the Old Testament the more thoroughly we shall be satisfied that the Messianic predictions are not isolated phenomena, nor accidents in the scheme, but component and important parts of it; that these utterances must have been shaped by the Divine prescience as truly as the whole scheme was prearranged of God; and that in the Divine intention these utterances carried from the first those ideas which we now find to be involved in them. And if God designed them, who shall prove that men did not in a measure comprehend them? That the prophets themselves, and the people to whom they were addressed, did not, to a greater or less extent, penetrate to their real meaning?

After the evidences, which have been given, it might well be thought superfluous to accumulate further proof of how completely Dr. Williams denies the presence of anything supernatural in the prophets. They have a mission from God in no other sense than all men of great and pure ideas, conscious of the truth and value of what they utter. It will, however, contribute to a juster understanding of the rigour with which he presses his fundamental principle, to state in a word how completely he rates them as men on a level with other men. The association of Sophocles, Cicero, and St. Paul (p. 37) finds repeated parallels in the combination of the prophets with the bards and philosophers of other lands, and even with Turkish dervishes, Popish confessors, and enthusiasts generally. Their sentiments though often commended are sometimes represented

as less liberal and just than those found elsewhere. They are spoken of as under the influence of human passion, frequently vindictive and governed by a narrow and contracted patriotism. When they enter into the region of politics they mistake their sphere and give injudicious advice, such as princes were justifiable in declining to act upon. "It is the old quarrel," he says, p. 366, "between the unseen and the seen, faith and flesh, the prophet and the soldier, the preaching Covenanter and counselling Cromwell, the simplicity which asks for prayers against cholera, and the statesmanship which recommends the removal of dirt." The false prophets and the true are put upon a level, and the strife between them is made the ground of a charge that there were factions in the prophetic order.

After what has been said it will surprise no one to hear that he speaks contemptuously of a book-revelation, and denies the reality of miracles. These are disposed of either by naturalistic explanations, or by denying the trustworthiness of the records in which they are found. In regard to the resurrection of Christ he holds the following hesitating and non-committal language, pp. 426, 427:

"Who can read the fifteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians, and say that the evidence of a community, summed up by St. Paul within thirty-five years of the event, leaves no stronger assurance on the mind than we possess as to the addition of fifteen years to Hezekiah's life, specified in 2 Kings xx., we know neither when nor by whom, and transcribed in this appendix (Isaiah xxxvi.—xxxix.) some years, we know, after the hymn of Hezekiah had existed as a separate fragment? That Christ rose bodily from the grave on the third day, rests historically on the belief of the hundred and twenty men, who met in the upper chamber (Acts i. 15—22). The most natural account of their belief is that it had a correspondent fact; this is enough to strengthen the hope of believers in Christ. If the evidence from the first day to our own has satisfied friends without satisfying foes, and so wants the compulsory force of demonstration (*as there are signs of its passing through an oral stage*) this may show it was not meant to be a foundation, but a confirmation of the faith which enters within the veil. To those who receive Christ as the Son of God, his death seems far more miraculous

than his resurrection. Those who acknowledge him but as the Son of Man, must feel his teaching to be an element of credibility in the subsequent story. The worthiness of the occasion, the dignity of the person, the nearness of the attestation, the importance to mankind of the immortality involved in the event, and the ever recurrent necessity of belief in this or some kindred pledge of our destiny, remove Christ's resurrection out of the category to which the specification of Hezekiah's fifteen years and the return of the shadow on the dial belong. It may be of God's goodness that He would not rest our faith absolutely on display of power in the past, lest learning should avail more than piety, and scholars believe more immediately than the meek of heart; He may give adequate assurance as a reward to those who without seeing have loved, yet not change the idea of faith, which is to endure as seeing the unseen; at any rate, the event best attested in the New Testament, the most sacredly associated with our hope, and most important, *if we hold it*, in all history, deserves a nobler use than polemical employment to bias interpretation elsewhere."

His attitude upon some of the questions now agitated in church and state, may be inferred from the following passage, pp. 217, 218, with which we shall conclude our notice of this volume.

"The extent to which Isaiah interposed in the policy of his times, resembling in that respect Ambrose and the more statesmanlike of the Fathers, renders it natural to ask, what would have been his judgment on some of the questions of our age. We can hardly imagine the developments of our commerce, our colonies on every sea, our boundless luxury, with abject poverty by its side, as entering into his conception. Yet the sentiments in which his large genius would have indulged, are too clear from the expressions which he used of Tyre and her merchant princes; we may fear that much explanation from our economists would have been needed to reconcile him to some of our social inequalities. We may be too sure, no explanation would have induced him to tolerate such laws of entail, as transmit encumbered and unimproved estates, with an inheritance of debt, while by logical necessity they render the tiller of the soil little better in physical well-being than the serf, sometimes

in moral aspiration, than the cattle which he drives. This remark should not be understood as if we were bound in the light of the gospel and of reason to consider the arrangements of Providence exhausted by the economy of Palestine; only if arrangements change, moral principles are permanent; at least it would be well, amidst professions of devotion to the Bible, not to close the eyes of our mind altogether to what the sacred writers would have said, had they been writing of ourselves. Again, as regards provision for the external maintenance of religion, nothing is clearer than that whatever theory excludes religion from the commonwealth, leaving men to guess what should be right in their own eyes, would have seemed to the prophet national atheism. By divine right he would have parliaments or presidents, no less than princes, govern and be governed, and the priest's lips keep knowledge. He would not have expected the living coal from the altar to touch the lips of crazy volubility in preference to those of a rightful officer. Yet no system which hardened itself in a tradition of forms or suppressed fresh truths and confessed itself a stranger to inspiration, and incapable of profiting by experience, could have satisfied him. He might, in an historically descended society, have borne articles but few and not inconsistent with each other or with their adjuncts; prayers he would probably have had fixed, but not without elasticity of provision for circumstances and for creative devotion; whatever creed he had beyond a promise to fear the living God, could have been neither a forgery, nor have contained malediction. Most alien of all from his own mind, would have been an ecclesiastical system without faith in the unseen, or one which broadens religion by depriving it of all which breathes life. He would as little understand the claim of a majority, as that of a priesthood, to decide what only God can make true."

SHORT NOTICES.

History of the Reformation in the time of Calvin. By J. H. D'Aubigné, D.D. Vol. IV.—England, Geneva, France, Germany, and Italy. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 491.

The great charm of D'Aubigné is his graphic power. He has the talent of bringing the persons and scenes which he describes clearly before the mind of the reader, and securing his interest in them, even when indifferent to the cause they represent. When to this is added laborious research, fidelity in statement, and cordial sympathy in all that is good and true, it is not surprising that his historical writings have secured so high a place in the estimation of the Christian public. This new volume will doubtless meet with a general welcome.

Superstition and Force. Essays on the Wager of Law. The Wager of Battle. The Ordeal. Torture. By Henry C. Lea. Philadelphia: Henry C. Lea. 1866. Pp. 401.

"The aim," says the author, "of these Essays is simply to group together facts so that, with a slender thread of commentary, they may present certain phases of human society and progress which are not without interest for the student of history and of man." We have seldom taken up a volume more replete with curious and interesting information. The learning and research which it evinces are highly creditable to the writer; and the facts which he has so laboriously collected and arranged, are a most instructive exhibition of the state of society and of the perverted exercises of the human mind in the past ages of the world. The volume will have a permanent value in the estimation of all whose attention is turned to this wide class of subjects.

Asiatic Cholera. A Treatise on its Origin, Pathology, Treatment, and Cure. By E. Whitney, M. D., and A. B. Whitney, A. M., M. D, late Physician and Surgeon to Diseases of Women in the North-Western Dispensary, &c. New York: M. W. Dodd, Publisher, No. 506 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 214.

The cholera is so fearful a disease; its attacks are so insidious, its progress so rapid, and its termination so often fatal, that every intelligent man should know how to treat it. So much depends upon prompt attention to the first symptoms, that

many lives are lost before professional attendance can be secured. The public should be on their guard against mere nostrums; but this is no reason why educated men should not endeavour to learn from the best medical authorities, what to do when an emergency arises. This work of the Doctors Whitney is adapted to general circulation. It gives the information which the public needs, and its prescriptions rest on the authority not of the writers only, but of the practitioners to whom reference is made.

Omnipotence of Loving-Kindness: Being a Narrative of the Results of a Lady's Seven Months' Work among the Fallen in Glasgow. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1867. Pp. 340.

Pauperism and that evil which has earned the preëminence of "The Social Evil," are the two great problems of modern civilization. That they are working the degradation and destruction of thousands; that they are increasing in extent and destructiveness; and that no means hitherto devised to arrest their progress have been successful, are facts generally admitted. There is great danger that philanthropists and Christians, lawgivers and social reformers, may give the matter up in despair. This would be a fatal mistake. With regard to the latter especially much may be done, both in removing the causes of the evil, and in redeeming its victims. So far as the cause is to be founded in the corruption of our nature, there is no cure but that provided in the gospel, and the moral and religious education of the people. Much, however, may be accomplished by wise legislation; much by providing and securing remunerative rewards for female labour; and much by measures taken to prevent a first error being absolutely fatal. As to the redemption of the fallen, this book shows what may be accomplished in a few months by a single devoted Christian woman. If it shall be the means of arousing public attention, and calling forth wise efforts in the work of prevention and recovery, it will accomplish a much-needed work.

The American Conflict. By Horace Greely. Vol. II. Hartford, Connecticut. O. D. Case & Co. 1866.

Our late war in its causes, events, and effects, will prove for years to come a fruitful source of varied productions of the press. The time has probably not yet come when a fair and comprehensive history of the war can be produced. This, however, does not interfere with the usefulness or value of contemporaneous histories. These accounts written by men of different views and prejudices will furnish the future historian with the means of looking at the great conflict in all its aspects.

Mr. Greely is a marked man. He has been a prominent actor in the struggles which preceded the war, and in the discussions which attended its progress. His opinions have always been pronounced, and often extreme. His prejudices are strong, and his judgments can hardly be impartial. But his admitted ability, and general honesty of purpose; the facilities which he has enjoyed for obtaining correct information, and the important documents which are cited or republished in his volumes, give to his work a value which will be appreciated and acknowledged, even by those who do not sympathize with his peculiar opinions.

The State of the Church and the World at the Final Outbreak of Evil, and Revelation of Antichrist and his destruction at the Second Coming of Christ, &c. By Rev. J. G. Gregory, M. A., with an Appendix by Mrs. A. P. Joliffe. Reprinted from the London Edition. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton, successor to Wm. S. & Alfred Martien, 1214 Chestnut Street. 1867. Pp. 256.

The Restoration; or, The Hope of the Early Church realized. By Rev. Henry A. Riley, with Introduction by Rev. J. A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. New York: Sheldon & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Cincinnati: G. L. Blanchard & Co. 1866. Pp. 288.

The prophecies of Scripture relating to the first advent of Christ were designed to keep the Redeemer promised to our first parents after the fall, constantly before the people as the object of faith and hope; and by their fulfilment to afford clear evidence that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah. These two important ends they fully accomplished. They did not avail to make the Old Testament believers prophets, or to lead them to right views of the manner of Christ's coming. The predictions of the Second Advent in the New Testament in like manner are designed to answer important purposes in elevating the hope and strengthening the faith of believers under the present dispensation. They have failed to render Christians prophets, as innumerable prognostications have been falsified by the event. This, however, does not lessen the confidence of modern interpreters. The press teems with such productions as those named above; all written with equal assurance of the correctness of the views which they present; and all anticipating a revival of Judaism more or less modified. The principles on which these books are written seem to us radically false, and the results to which they come in direct opposition to the whole drift of the New Testament teaching as to the nature of the kingdom which Christ came to establish, and, therefore, their whole tendency we regard as injurious to the interests of true religion.

Life and Times of John Milton. By W. Carlos Martin, Esq. Published by the American Tract Society. New York.

Most biographies of Milton have been fragmentary, or have failed to do justice to anything but his poetical character. The complete and exhaustive biography of Masson has never been fully republished in this country, and, at best, is too expensive and voluminous for general popular use. The present volume is designed to supply the desideratum which exists, of a life of Milton in a volume of moderate compass, which shall do him justice, "in his fourfold character of Christian, statesman, poet, and man."

Six Months at the White House with Abraham Lincoln. The Story of a Picture. By F. B. Carpenter. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. 1866.

Mr. Carpenter had the rare advantage of being in close communication with Mr. Lincoln, while painting his portrait, and those of his Cabinet, in connection with the scene involved in the framing and adoption of the great Emancipation Proclamation. The revelations and sketches it contains give an inside view of Mr. Lincoln's principles, purposes, and character, not elsewhere to be found. As such, it is an important addition to our means of estimating a man whom God has been pleased to make one of the great historic characters of the world. The author's enthusiastic appreciation of his subject infuses a warmth and vividness into his sketches which add greatly to its interest.

Among the Willows; or, How to Do Good. By J. H. Langille.

Lyntonville; or, the Irish Boy in Canada.

Sisters and not Sisters. By Mrs. M. E. Berry.

Leaves of Life. Striking facts and poetry, illustrating select passages from God's word.

Food for Lambs; or, A Selection of Texts for Young Children.

Hours with Mamma. By Mrs. S. E. Dawes.

The foregoing are recent issues of the American Tract Society, New York, for the young. The first three belong to its series entitled "Life Illustrated."

Pastoral Reminiscences by the late Rev. Martin Moore, of Boston, Mass. Published by the American Tract Society, New York.

Such reminiscences of the striking incidents in pastoral life are always interesting and profitable for ministers and private Christians.

The Reign of Grace. By Thomas Chalmers, D. D. Published by the American Tract Society, New York.

This is an Essay originally prefixed to Collins's edition of Booth's Reign of Grace. It has since been published as a separate tract, and has been of great service to distressed and inquiring souls.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

V. L. Biasi, Introductio in Sacram Scripturam. Vol. I. Archæology. 8vo. pp. xii. and 527.

Testamentum Novum Triglottum, Græce, Latine, Germanice. A. F. C. Tischendorf. 4to. pp. xlviii. and 930.

P. Butmann has published a collection of all the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus, which differ from his edition of the New Testament. 8vo. pp. viii. and 123.

H. Ewald is preparing a new edition of his Poetical Books of the Old Testament. The first half of Part I. has appeared, on Hebrew Poetry and the Book of Psalms in general. 8vo. pp. 301.

F. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah. 8vo. pp. xxiii. and 668. This is part of a continuous Commentary on the entire Old Testament prepared in concert by Professors Keil and Delitzsch. The latter has also written upon Job. Keil has published upon the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings: and a volume on the Minor Prophets is announced as shortly to appear from his pen.

T. Klieforth, The Book of Ezekiel Translated and Explained. Vol. II. Ezekiel's vision of the temple. 8vo. pp. 390.

J. P. Lange's Bibelwerk. Old Testament. Part V. Judges and Ruth, by P. Cassel, 8vo. pp. xx. and 242. New Testament. Part XV. The three Epistles of the Apostle John, by K. Braune. Pp. 149.

A. Maier, Commentary on the second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. 8vo. pp. 248.

F. Bleek, Lectures on the Epistles to the Colossians, Philemon, and the Ephesians. 8vo. pp. 308. A posthumous publication.

G. Volkmar, The Origin of our Gospels. 8vo. pp. 166.

L. M. Roth, De Stella a Magis Conspecta. Exegetical Comment on Matt. ii. 9. 8vo. pp. 26.

P. Scholz, The Marriages of the Sons of God with the Daughters of Men. Treatise on Gen. vi. 1—4. 8vo. pp. 123.

E. Pressensé's Jesus Christ, His Times, Life, and Work, (in reply to Renan) has been translated into German. 8vo. pp. 504.

H. Sevin, The first three Gospels synoptically compared. 8vo. pp. 240.

A. Billroth, The Resurrection of Jesus and Dr. Strauss. A lecture delivered before a literary society. 16mo. pp. 34.

F. Delitzsch, Jesus and Hillel. A comparison made with reference to Renan and Geiger. 8vo. pp. 40.

C. Tischendorf, When were our Gospels composed? 4th materially enlarged edition. 8vo. pp. 130.

J. Kayser, On the so-called Epistle of Barnabas. 8vo. pp. 150.

A. Hilgenfeld, Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum. No. 1. 8vo. pp. 116. Containing the Epistles of Clemens Romanus, with a critical commentary and annotations; also all that is extant of the Assumption of Moses.

J. H. Kurtz, On the Theology of the Psalms. 8vo. pp. 173.

Commentary of Japhet ben Eli the Karaite on Prov. xxx. in Arabic, with a Latin translation and notes by Z. Auerbach. 8vo. pp. 47.

Jacut's Geographical Dictionary from MSS. at Berlin, St. Petersburgh, and Paris. Published at the expense of the German Oriental Society, by F. Wüstenfeld. Vol. I. 1st half 8vo. pp. 492. To be completed in eight half-volumes.

Several numbers have appeared of the Monumentæ Sacra et Profanæ, mostly from the MSS. of the Ambrosian Library.

J. Levy, Chaldee Dictionary for the Targums, and a large part of the Rabbinical Writings. Nos. 1—3. 4to. pp. 288. To be completed in 8 or 9 numbers by the close of the present year.

Talmud Babylonicum, with all the ancient and some modern Commentaries, edited by A. Soloman in the original Hebrew. Vol. 12. 8vo. pp. 428.

S. A. Wolff, Mishnah Readings, or Talmud texts of a religious and moral character. No. 1. 8vo. pp. 76. The original is supplied with vowels, and accompanied with a German translation and explanatory remarks.

J. Wunderbar, Biblico-Talmudical Medicine. 8vo. pp. 178.

Zunz, Literary History of Synagogue Poetry. 8vo. pp. 666. The list of Jewish writers, whose poetical productions are described in this volume, amounts to nine hundred and fifty.

A. Dillmann, Ethiopic Chrestomathy with a Glossary. 8vo. pp. 291. This contains, besides the book of Baruch, extracts from homilies and ecclesiastical writings never before published. The Ethiopic Grammar of Dillmann and his complete Lexicon already issued, afford facilities for the thorough acquisition of this twin-sister of the Arabic.

F. Müller, On the Origin of the Himyaritic-Ethiopic Writing. 8vo. pp. 8.

J. B. Wenig, Schola Syriaca. Part I. containing a Chrestomathy and Grammar. 8vo. pp. lxxx. and 270. The second part is to supply a lexicon adapted to the Chrestomathy.

H. Brugsch and J. Duemichen, Recueil de Monumens Egyptiens. Part 4. Geographical Inscriptions of the ancient Egyptian Monuments, with an Appendix containing the notices found in the Temple of Edfu in the years 1863—5, collected on the spot, and illustrated by J. Duemichen, with 100 lithographs.

H. Barth, Collection of vocabularies of Central African Languages. 4to. pp. 295.

Bibliotheca Tamulica. Vol. IV. Kural of Tiruvalluver, High Tamil text, with a translation into common Tamil and Latin, notes and Glossary. By Dr. Charles Graue. Published after the author's death. 8vo. pp. 335.

Gallia Christiana in Provincias Ecclesiasticas distributa; an account of the Archbishops, Bishops, and Abbots of all the territories embraced in ancient Gaul from the origin of the churches to the present time, from authentic documents. Vol. XV. De Provincia Vesuntionensi. Vol. XVI. De Provincia Viennensi. Folio. Paris, Didot fréres.

A. Stöckl, History of the Philosophy of the Middle Ages. Vol. II. Reign of Scholasticism. 8vo. pp. 1159.

G. Frank, History of Protestant Theology. Part 2. From George Calixtus to the Wolfian Philosophy. 8vo. pp. 410.

C. A. Torén, Evangelical Religious Instruction in Germany, Great Britain, and Denmark. 8vo. pp. 171.

Facciolati, Forcellini et Furlanetti, Lexicon totius Latinitatis, auctius, emendatius, melioremque in formam redactum, curante F. Corradini. Vol. II. Nos. 1 and 2. 4to. pp. 160. Patavii.

J. A. Hartung, The Religion and Mythology of the Greeks. Part 2. The Kingdom of Kronos. 8vo. pp. 250.

H. Kellner, Hellenism and Christianity, or the Spiritual Reaction of Ancient Heathenism against Christianity. 8vo. pp. 454.